3 1761 05973625 6

PRESENTED
BY THE
Church of England
Book Society,
11, ADAM STREET, LONDON.
FOUNDED 1880.

Treasurer.
FRANK A. BEVAN, ESQ.

Secretary.
JOHN SHRIMPTON, ESQ.

I. E. S. Lillie.

1869.

THE

# NATURE OF CHRIST'S PRESENCE

IN THE

# EUCHARIST.

LONDON:
PRINTED BY C. F. HODGSON,
1, GOUGH SQUARE, FLEET STREET.

RTheol G

THE

# NATURE OF CHRIST'S PRESENCE

IN THE

# EUCHARIST:

OR,

THE TRUE DOCTRINE OF

# THE REAL PRESENCE

VINDICATED

IN OPPOSITION TO THE FICTITIOUS REAL PRESENCE

ASSERTED BY

ARCHDEACON DENISON, MR. (LATE ARCHDEACON) WILBERFORCE, AND DR. PUSEY:

WITH FULL PROOF OF THE REAL CHARACTER OF THE ATTEMPT MADE BY THOSE AUTHORS TO REPRESENT THEIR DOCTRINE AS THAT OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND HER DIVINES.

By WILLIAM GOODE, M.A., F.S.A.,
Rector of St. Margaret Lothbury, London.

"To say that the communion of our Lord's body and blood means the receiving his natural flesh and blood into our mouths, *under the forms, accidents, or appearances of bread and wine*, is manifestly a forced and late interpretation; not heard of for eight hundred years or more, and besides absurd, contradictory, and impossible. .... To say that the communion of our Lord's body and blood means the receiving his natural flesh and blood into our mouths, *together with the symbols*, would be running into *the like absurdities with the former*."—ARCHDEACON WATERLAND.

"While men SLEPT, the enemy came and sowed tares among the wheat, and went his way."

VOL. I.

LONDON:
PUBLISHED BY T. HATCHARD, 187, PICCADILLY

1856.

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY

3327
19/5/90

# PREFACE.

On the importance of the *subject* of the following Work, there can be no difference of opinion. It would seem to follow, that it is of equal importance to preserve the public mind free from serious error respecting it. And when errors of a grave character are being widely and earnestly disseminated, a public discussion of the subject, an endeavour to prove the true character of the rite, and a refutation of the erroneous notions inculcated respecting it, are due to the cause of truth.

I cannot, therefore, at all sympathize with the feeling of those who profess to think the subject too sacred for public discussion; and I confess that I cannot free my mind from the notion, that the hope of some advantage accruing to certain doctrines from a veil of mystery being thrown over the Eucharistic rite, is very near the foundation of such a feeling. No public discussion of the nature of the rite, such as our Lord intended it to be, could lead to anything painful to a Christian ear. And if the errors and superstitions with which man has overlaid it produce that tendency, let them bear the blame; but let not the cause of truth suffer by our unwillingness to vindicate it, because men have encumbered it with notions which make its discussion painful.

The doctrine treated of in the following Work was the great question controverted between the Romanists and our early Reformers. For, though the doctrine of the Authors under review does not necessarily involve the *whole* doctrine of Transubstantiation, it was the *great*

*point* in the doctrine of Transubstantiation to which our divines have always objected. It was chiefly on account of its involving *such* a doctrine of the Real Presence as that held by the Authors under review, that Transubstantiation was rejected by our Reformers. This, I trust, is sufficiently proved in the following pages.

But, as the *phrase* "Real Presence" is used by many of our divines, advantage has been taken of this circumstance to represent them as maintaining a doctrine which is in fact that of Rome itself, and is the foundation of the doctrine of Transubstantiation.

As far as Archdeacon Denison is concerned, it is evident that he formed his scheme of doctrine without a sufficient acquaintance with the facts of the case. While he considers himself to be opposing the doctrine of Rome respecting the nature of the Real Presence, he is in fact maintaining it; imagining that the Church of Rome holds a *material* presence, which is a complete mistake. He supposes that by calling the Presence he holds a *spiritual* presence, he distinguishes it from the presence implied both by the doctrine of Transubstantiation and Consubstantiation.[1] But they who hold these doctrines maintain as much as he does that the presence is a *spiritual* presence, meaning that Christ's body is really present in the form of a spirit. And this interpretation of the phrase Archdeacon Denison adopts, and seems in fact acquainted with no other. He has thus turned the *spiritual eating of Christ's flesh* which our divines maintain, meaning an act of the soul, into *the bodily eating of Christ's flesh present in the form of a spirit*, and thus involved himself in all the absurdities pointed out by all our divines, who have treated dogmatically on the point, as attending such a notion. And here lies, what I must be permitted to call, his great and primary error; of which, if he will take Bishop Jeremy Taylor as his guide on the point, he will at once be convinced by turning to the passage quoted from him in pp. 843, 844 below.

Other similar errors as to the doctrine of the Lutherans, and the use of the term Real Presence, and the view taken by our divines of the doctrine of the Fathers, show that he entered the lists quite unacquainted with the history of the controversy and the views

[1] See pp. 593, 594 below.

that have been propounded on the subject. All this I have fully shown by extracts from his sermons in pp. 589—594 and elsewhere.

The controversy might perhaps be almost wholly summed up in one brief question,—Is the reception of the true Body and Blood of Christ an act of the body or of the soul, of the mouth or of faith?

On one side, those who hold the doctrine of the Presence of that Body and Blood in or with or under the forms of the elements, maintain that the *reception* is an act of the body, the soul of the believer feeding upon them by faith *after* that reception.

On the other side it is maintained, that there is no such presence in the consecrated substances themselves, and that the *reception* is an act of the soul, an act of faith.

The phrase "real presence" is used by both parties.

By the former it is used to describe their doctrine as denoting an actual presence of the body of Christ, though in an invisible and immaterial form, to the bodies of men, in the consecrated substances received into the mouth.

The latter also use the phrase, inasmuch as they maintain, that the presence of that body to the soul, to influence and invigorate it, is as real, spiritually considered, as a local presence of it to our bodies. Just as Augustine says, that the woman that only touched the border of Christ's garment touched him by faith more than the crowd that pressed upon him. And as Bishop Jewel says, "The thing that is inwardly received in faith and in spirit is received verily and indeed." [1]

Many are deceived by the profession made by the Romanists and the Authors under review, of *understanding our Lord's words*, "This is my body," *literally*, and not flying unnecessarily to figurative interpretations. But the fact is, that they more than any others fly to metaphorical senses to get their meaning out of the words. For instance, when our Lord took up a piece of bread and said, "*This* is my body," common sense tells us, that the word *this* means *this piece of bread*. But such an interpretation is fatal to their doctrine, as Bellarmine himself admits, for he candidly confesses that if our Lord had said, "This piece of bread is my body,"

[1] Works, P.S. ed. vol. i. p. 475.

the words must mean, "This piece of bread represents my body," because a piece of bread cannot any otherwise *be* the body of Christ than in this way. Now this, I contend, is what our Lord *did* say.

And if the question is asked of the Romanists, or the Authors under review, what the word "*this*" means, no satisfactory answer can be obtained.

Again, as to the word *body*, their interpretation is as far as possible from the literal (and I may add necessary) sense of the word. For while they admit that our Lord's body was, and is now in heaven, a material body, they dare not affirm that *body* in those words means a material body, but are compelled to resort to the supposition that it means our Lord's body in the form of a spirit, that is, a body which is *not* a body, but a spirit; which bodiless body they tell us we are to eat with our mouths.

The whole difficulty that is felt in interpreting such phrases as *real Presence* and *real reception*, and eating and drinking the Body and Blood of Christ, arises from the carnal and earthly notions with which men come to the subject. They cannot hear of eating and drinking the flesh and blood of Christ without thinking immediately of the *bodily mouth*, and connecting the words in some way with bodily acts and oral swallowing. If only they would put the body out of sight for the moment, and think merely of the soul and its acts, they would find no difficulty in understanding such language. Then it would be clearly seen what such eating and drinking is, and the terms *really, &c.*, would be seen to be properly used for the purpose of discriminating a true and real union with Christ, and participation of the Spirit that dwells in him, and complete communion with his human nature, from a mere act of the reflective powers of the mind meditating upon the person of Christ, and remembering with gratitude his death and passion.

And while the use of such phraseology, as for instance in our Catechism, has exposed us to the charge of Romish doctrine, and tended to mislead uninformed individuals among us, who have not been taught to understand these words in their intended meaning, there has also been an important object in view in their use; and that is, that we should not allow ourselves to be robbed of a phraseology which in its spiritual sense is the proper phrase-

ology to adopt in the matter, and appear to deny that high and sacred purpose which is to be accomplished in the Lord's Supper, for the sake of preventing that misapprehension of our meaning which arises from a carnal and earthly-minded interpretation of the words. Nay more, this is the phraseology which our Blessed Lord himself has used to describe our reception of him. And therefore in hesitating to adopt it, we should be making our wisdom rather than his the standard by which to be guided. "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, ye have no life in you." Justly, then, does our Catechism say, that his Body and Blood are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper. And the only reason why any difficulty is experienced in the interpretation of these words is, that men are apt to run off immediately to the notion of *bodily* eating and drinking, because our Lord has graciously instituted a rite in which by visible and bodily acts we are *reminded* of the *spiritual* acts expressed in his words; forgetting that all which is seen and done by the body in that rite—i.e. both the things given to and received by the body and the acts of the body—are but outward representations of that spiritual gift and that spiritual act which are, as it were, the soul of the ordinance.

The question at issue in the present controversy is no party question. High-Churchmen, as they are called, have, till very recently, agreed with Low-Churchmen in repudiating the doctrine of the Authors under review, as I hope I have very sufficiently shown in the seventh Chapter. What has to be decided is, Whether the barriers that have been erected in our authorized Formularies against very serious error on the subject of the Eucharist, and supported by the unanimous testimony of all our great divines, are to be thrown down, and every limit to false doctrine be removed. For if a doctrine so directly and expressly opposed to the Articles as that of Archdeacon Denison is to be allowed to be inculcated among us, no charge of false doctrine, even though it affected the Divinity of our Saviour, could be justly entertained, for the contradiction to the Articles could not be more express.

Are then the formal definitions of doctrine, laid down in the Articles of our Church, subscribed by her ministers, and maintained

by the whole stream of her great divines, to be treated as nullities, and every man be permitted to teach that which is right in his own eyes? This is the question which has now to be determined. And a more important question, and one involving more serious consequences to our Church, could hardly be conceived.

May God grant his blessing to the humble endeavor made in these volumes to illustrate and enforce what the writer believes to be His truth.

W. GOODE.

20, Finsbury Square, London;
*Sept.* 25, 1856.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## TO VOL. I.


PAGE

PREFACE ..... V—X

### CHAPTER I.

PRELIMINARY REMARKS ON THE DOCTRINE OF ARCHDEACON DENISON, DR. PUSEY, AND ARCHDEACON WILBERFORCE, AS TO THE NATURE OF CHRIST'S PRESENCE IN THE SACRAMENT OF THE LORD'S SUPPER; SHOWING THE CHARACTER OF THE CONTROVERSY AS AFFECTING THE VERY FOUNDATIONS ON WHICH OUR REFORMED CHURCH STANDS ..... 1—10

### CHAPTER II.

THE DOCTRINE OF ARCHDEACON DENISON, DR. PUSEY, AND ARCHDEACON WILBERFORCE, ON THE SUBJECT OF THIS WORK, SHOWN BY EXTRACTS FROM THEIR WRITINGS, WITH SOME REMARKS ON ITS TRUE NATURE ..... 11—55

Archdeacon Denison's doctrine ..... 11—20

Dr. Pusey's doctrine ..... 20—22

Archdeacon Wilberforce's doctrine ..... 22—28

Real presence of Christ in the Sacrament confounded by them with his real presence in elements ..... 29—40

On the phrase "Under the form of bread and wine" in the Advertisement to the first book of Homilies ..... 40—47

General remarks on the doctrine of Archdeacon Denison, Dr. Pusey, and Archdeacon Wilberforce ..... 47—55

### CHAPTER III.

EXAMINATION OF THE SCRIPTURAL ARGUMENT ON THE SUBJECT .. 56—129

On the account given by Matthew, Mark, and Luke, in their Gospels, and St. Paul, in 1 Cor. x. xi., of the institution of the Lord's Supper 57— 91

On John vi. 50—58 ..... 91—129

### CHAPTER IV.

EXAMINATION OF THE REASONABLENESS OF THE DOCTRINE OF ARCHDEACON DENISON, DR. PUSEY, AND ARCHDEACON WILBERFORCE, ON THE SUBJECT OF THIS WORK ..... 130—224

PAGE

I. The objections that present themselves to the doctrine under review 131—194

(1) The doctrine in question is opposed to the testimony of Scripture as to Christ's departure from the world, ascension, and session at the right hand of the Father until the end of the world ..... 131—134

(2) That Christ's Body, being a human Body, cannot be present in more than one place at one and the same time..... 134—173

(3) This doctrine supposes the living Saviour, God and man in one person, to be, whole and entire, in every morsel of the consecrated bread, and with a presence multiplied according to the number of the fragments into which any one may break the bread, and to pass into the mouth and stomach of every communicant ..... 173—177

(4) The supposed bodily manducation of Christ's Body is utterly useless and unprofitable ..... 177—180

(5) This doctrine is inconsistent with the necessary union of the Body and Blood in the living Saviour..... 180—183

(6) This doctrine supposes the Body and Blood of Christ partaken of in the Eucharist to be immaterial and like a spirit, while the words of our Lord show us, that the Body to be eaten there is the material body that was crucified on the cross, and the blood to be drunk there is the blood shed on the cross. 183

(7) This doctrine supposes an oral manducation of an immaterial thing, a thing present only after the mode of existence belonging to a Spirit; which is a manifest absurdity..... 184—186

(8) This doctrine either makes the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper consist of three parts instead of two, or makes the second part different from what the antient Church and our own maintain it to be ..... 186—190

(9) The eating of Christ's Body by the mouth of the communicant is the very notion of the Capernaites which our Lord rebuked..... 190, 191

(10) If the Body and Blood of Christ are so joined to the bread and wine that the mouth of every communicant in receiving one necessarily receives the other, then brute animals eating and drinking the bread and wine, receive the Body and Blood of Christ ..... 191—194

II. The sophisms and fallacies by which the doctrine of the Authors under review is supported ..... 194—224

(1) That a denial of their doctrine as to the effects of consecration, makes the consecration a mere nugatory act ..... 194—206

(2) The charge of Zuinglianism or Calvinism against all who interpret the words of institution figuratively; and the calumny that a denial of the real bodily presence in the elements involves the assertion that the consecrated bread and wine are in all cases mere naked and inoperative signs 206—210

( ) The application of the phrase "real spiritual presence" to mean the real presence of Christ's Body after the manner of existence of a Spirit ..... 210—213

(4) The pretence of denying a corporal and only holding a spiritual presence ..... 214, 215

(5) The objection, How can we eat Christ's Body by faith?..... 215—218

(6) That the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper consists of an outward sign and the thing signified joined together; and if all do not receive the thing signified, there must be some of the communicants who do not receive the sacrament ..... 218 -221

(7) That a sufficient reply to all objections is that God is Omnipotent ..... 221

(8) The frequent use of phrases that bear two senses, and the misapplication of passages from our great divines containing such phrases, for the purpose of proving doctrine opposed to the manifest views of their authors..... 221—224

## CHAPTER V.

PAGE

THE TESTIMONY OF THE FATHERS ..... 225—612

SECTION I.

Preliminary remarks ..... 225—235

SECTION II.

The direct Testimony of the Fathers in favor of the doctrine maintained in this work ..... 235—438

(1) The Fathers tell us, that what our Lord gave to his disciples was bread and wine ..... 235—237

(2) They speak of that which is called the Lord's Body in the Eucharist as being *bread*, and that which is called his Blood as being *wine* ..... 237—240

(3) They say also, that our Lord's Body, as it exists in the Eucharist, is *made of bread*, and his Blood of *wine;* which can only refer to a representative presence of his Body and Blood by the bread and wine ..... 240, 241

(4) They give us reasons why the bread in the Eucharist is called Christ's Body and the wine his Blood, showing that they did not consider them to be so really, but only representatively ..... 241—243

(5) That which the Fathers call the Body and Blood of Christ in the Eucharist, they speak of in terms not applicable to our Lord's real Body and Blood, present in an immaterial form, but only applicable to the material elements ..... 243—245

(6) The consecrated sacramental substances were used in the Antient Church in a way which is utterly irreconcileable with the notion of their being, or having conjoined to them, the real Body and Blood of Christ ..... 245—247

(7) Hence the Fathers themselves tell us, that it is customary to call *the signs* in the Eucharist, as in other cases, by the names of *the things signified* by them, the consecrated bread and wine being styled the Body and Blood of Christ, as figuratively representing them ..... 247—250

(8) The *sacramentum* and the *res sacramenti* do not, according to the Fathers, form one compound whole in the consecrated substances, and the latter is not necessarily received by all who receive the consecrated substances ..... 250—255

(9) The Fathers say, that the sacraments of the New Testament (when using the word in the sense of the consecrated sacramental substances or entities) are signs ..... 255—260

(10) They expressly call the *consecrated sacramental substances* in the Eucharist *figures, signs, symbols, antitypes*, &c. of the Body and Blood of Christ, and therefore could not hold them to be, or to include, the real Body and Blood of Christ ..... 260—280

(11) The Fathers tell us, that in the Eucharist the Body of Christ is present as *dead*, and his Blood as *shed*, upon the Cross, and that we eat and drink them *as such;* and they cannot be really and substantially present in this form, as they do not now exist in it ..... 280—283

(12) The reasons given by the Fathers for mixing water with the wine in the Eucharist still further show their views with respect to the nature of the rite ..... 283—287

(13) It was the opinion of the Fathers, that the Body of Christ in the Eucharist is a sacrament not only of that Body that hung upon the cross, but of that mystical Body of Christ that consists of all true believers; and they speak of the latter *being received* in the Eucharist just as they do of the former; and therefore only in a figurative sense of both ..... 287—293

PAGE

(14) The Fathers held *multipresence* to prove the possession of the attribute of *omnipresence*, and so to manifest the real and proper divinity of that to which it belonged..... 293—297

(15) The Fathers assert, that Christ is absent from us so far as his human nature is concerned, and present only by his divinity ..... 297—309

(16) The Fathers assert, that Christ's risen body can only be in one place ..... 309—316

(17) If there was a real bodily presence of Christ in or under the elements on the table, our minds ought to be fixed on that which is on the table; but, on the contrary, the Fathers exhort us to raise our thoughts above that which is on the table to that which is in heaven ..... 316—323

(18) The Fathers tell us, that we eat and drink the body and blood of Christ not only in the Eucharist, but when we read the Holy Scriptures; the body and blood spoken of by our Saviour as to be eaten and drunk by us being the Holy Scriptures; which illustrates their view of the *nature* of the act... 323—326

(19) The Fathers maintain, that the faithful eat the flesh of Christ, and drink his blood, in Baptism ..... 326—328

(20) The real flesh and blood of Christ are not, according to the Fathers, eaten and drunk orally in the Eucharist ..... 328—336

(21) The Fathers maintain, that the eating and drinking of Christ's Body and Blood by us is an act of the soul through faith ..... 336—350

(22) The Fathers assert, that the wicked do not eat and drink the real body and blood of Christ, but only the sacramental or representative body and blood..... 350—374

(23) The Fathers maintain, that we are incorporated into Christ by faith..... 374—377

(24) The Fathers maintain, that we are incorporated into Christ by Baptism ..... 377—381

(25) Language parallel to that used by the Fathers with respect to the Eucharist, and on account of which they are referred to as maintaining the doctrine of a real objective presence of the Body and Blood of Christ, in or with or under the consecrated bread and wine, or under their forms, is also used by them with reference to the sacrament of Baptism, where such language confessedly is not used to imply any such presence 381—391

(26) Against the doctrine of Transubstantiation in particular the Fathers clearly testify, that the elements remain the same in their nature and substance after consecration, and that they give bodily nourishment to those who partake of them ..... 391—395

(27) The change which some of the Fathers speak of as taking place in the Eucharistic elements on consecration is described by them in terms of the same kind as those in which they speak of a change taking place on consecration in the water of Baptism, and in the chrism; and therefore, apparently, was not supposed to be more than a change of character, use, and effect, and certainly not such a change as to make the body and blood of Christ constitute with them, or their forms, one compound whole ..... 395—417

(28) The Fathers, while they held that the body of Christ, as it respects its substance, is absent in heaven, also maintained, that the presence of that body to faith is a real presence;—a more real presence to our souls, according to Augustine, than if our bodies touched it;—and they maintained, that in the Eucharist there is a special presence f that body to the faithful communicant, through the operation of the Holy Spirit, and a reception of it such as produces or renews a spiritual union between our Lord's human nature and the believer; and that by the agency of that Spirit we are made partakers of the virtue that dwells in it, while its substance is nevertheless absent from us in heaven ..... 417—438

## Section III.

PAGE

Testimony of the antient Liturgies ..... 439—465

General remarks on these Liturgies ..... 439—441
Consideration of the arguments derived from the Oriental Liturgies in favor of the doctrine here controverted ..... 441—456
Notice of passages in the Oriental Liturgies opposed to the doctrine here controverted ..... 456—461
Notice of the Liturgies of the Western Church, with proofs that the Romish "Canon of the Mass" is inconsistent with the doctrine here controverted ..... 461—465

## Section IV.

Review of the statements of those Fathers who are chiefly relied upon by the Authors under review for the support of their doctrine .... 465—589

Ignatius ..... 466—469
Justin Martyr ..... 469—473
Irenæus ..... 473—480
Cyril of Jerusalem ..... 481—491
Ambrose ..... 492—501
Augustine ..... 502—525
Chrysostom ..... 525—543
Cyril of Alexandria ..... 543—571
Hilary of Poictiers ..... 571—581
Theodoret ..... 582—589

## Section V.

General remarks on the character of the argument deduced from the Fathers by the Authors under review in favor of their doctrine of the Real Presence ..... 589—610

On the argument of Archdeacon Denison, with proofs of his want of acquaintance with the subject ..... 589—594
On the argument of Dr. Pusey ..... 594—596
On the argument of Archdeacon Wilberforce, pointing out its leading grounds, and where they are met in this work ..... 596—598
General observations on the nature of the argument of Dr. Pusey and Archdeacon Wilberforce; showing—
(1) That both these writers keep entirely out of sight a fact that largely affects the meaning of seven-tenths of the passages that can be quoted from the Fathers on this subject,—namely, that it was the common practice of the Fathers to call the signs by the names of the things signified ..... 598
(2) That almost all their extracts and arguments altogether fail even to reach the point at issue ..... 598—602
(3) That many of their quotations are made without due regard to the object the writer had in view, and are thus misapplied to a point not referred to in his words ..... 602, 603
(4) That their interpretation of the Fathers is self-contradictory ..... 603, 604
(5) That they adapt the statements of the Fathers to their own preconceived doctrine, instead of modelling their doctrine by the statements of the Fathers ..... 604—610

## Section VI.

General remarks on the caution necessary in judging of the doctrine of the Fathers ..... 610—612

# ERRATA AND ADDENDA.

Page 2. Add to works mentioned in the note,—The Doctrine of the Real Presence as contained in the Fathers, &c. vindicated in Notes on a Sermon, &c. By Rev. E. B. Pusey, D.D, &c. Oxf. & Lond. 1855. 8vo.

Page 121, l. 6 & 9. For—in some MSS—read—in some editions, without, it is said, the authority of the MSS.

Ibid. l. 8. For—presses—read—press.

Page 123, l. 14. It should have been stated here, that the passage quoted is Fulgentius's representation of Augustine's words.

Page 125. l. 36. Add,—Archdeacon Wilberforce's mistake has arisen from his confounding the Letter of Cyril of which he speaks, with *another* Letter of his to Nestorius, which was read at an earlier stage of the proceedings of the Council, and to which *most* of the Bishops there assembled, but *not all*, signified their assent. And this latter Letter will not answer his purpose.

Page 243, l. 26. After—*Blood*—add—*present in an immaterial form.*

Page 256, l. 20, 21. Instead of—Again he says, that sacraments are "visible signs of divine things—read—Again, speaking of sacraments, he says, that "the signs of divine things are visible.

Page 257, l. 13. On word "convey," add the following note—WILB. Doctr. of Euch. p. 118.

Page 402, l. 5. For—a complete transformation of the elements into—read—that the elements are changed so as to contain within themselves, or under their forms.

Page 520, l. 25. For—qouted—read—quoted.

# THE NATURE OF CHRIST'S PRESENCE IN THE EUCHARIST.

## CHAPTER I.

PRELIMINARY REMARKS ON THE DOCTRINE OF ARCHDEACON DENISON, DR. PUSEY, AND ARCHDEACON WILBERFORCE AS TO THE NATURE OF CHRIST'S PRESENCE IN THE SACRAMENT OF THE LORD'S SUPPER; SHOWING THE CHARACTER OF THE CONTROVERSY AS AFFECTING THE VERY FOUNDATIONS ON WHICH OUR REFORMED CHURCH STANDS.

To any one at all acquainted with the nature of the controversy which our Reformers carried on with the Church of Rome, and the principles which they laid down as the foundations of the faith of our Reformed Church, it is needless to remark, that the doctrine now maintained among us by Archdeacon Denison, Archdeacon Wilberforce, and Dr. Pusey, on the nature of Christ's presence in the Eucharist, involves some of the chief errors to oppose which our early Reformers suffered and died.

The doctrine of Archdeacon Wilberforce, indeed, approaches so near to that of the Church of Rome, as I shall hereafter show, that it is difficult to see what difference he himself can suppose to exist between the two. And though Archdeacon Denison has not expressly repeated all his statements, yet as he refers to the work of Archdeacon Wilberforce as one that upholds the true doctrine on the subject of the Eucharist, and worthy of the highest regard, it is to be feared that he is virtually involved in the same errors.

But I shall deal with their respective statements as I find them in their recently published works.[1]

The doctrine of Archdeacon Denison and Dr. Pusey, then, is, that, in the Lord's Supper, the Bread and Wine are so influenced and operated upon by the act of consecration, that though bread and wine remain, yet there is by consecration a real though spiritual presence of the Body and Blood of Christ so united to the Bread and Wine as to form with them one compound whole; and hence that the Body and Blood of Christ are received by *all* the communicants, whatever their state of mind may be. Whether they are present by transfusion or conjunction, they do not clearly state,—and the difference is unimportant, except as affecting the terms used,—but it is maintained, that that which the communicant puts into his mouth consists of two parts, one bread and wine, the other the Body and Blood of Christ present in a spiritual and supernatural manner in conjunction with the bread and wine. I do not stop here to prove that this is their doctrine, because that I purpose doing in the next chapter, nor to criticize this

[1] The works to which I here refer are the following:—

No 1. The Real Presence: a Sermon preached in the Cathedral Church of St. Andrew, Wells, on Sunday, Aug. 7, 1853. By G. A. Denison, M.A., Archdeacon of Taunton. With a Preface and Appendix. Lond. 1853. 8vo. 2nd ed. Lond. 1854. 8vo.

No. 2. The Real Presence: a Sermon preached in the Cathedral Church of St. Andrew, Wells, on Sunday, Nov. 6, 1853. By G. A. Denison, M.A., Archdeacon of Taunton. Lond. 1853. 8vo. 2nd ed. ib. 1854. 8vo.

No. 3. The Real Presence: Article XXIX. A Sermon preached in the Cathedral Church of St. Andrew, Wells, on Sunday, May 14, 1854. By G. A. Denison, M.A., Archdeacon of Taunton. With Preface and Appendix. Lond. 1854. 8vo. 2nd ed. ib. 1854. 8vo.

Statement of G. A. Denison, M.A., Archdeacon of Taunton, with reference to certain proceedings in connection with the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist. Lond. March 22, 1854. Lond. 1854. 8vo.

The Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist. By Rob. Is. Wilberforce, A.M., Archdeacon of the East Riding. Lond. 1853. 8vo. 2nd ed. 1853. sm. 8vo. 3rd ed. ib. 1854. sm. 8vo.

The Real Presence taught by the Prayer Book. A Charge to the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of the East Riding at the Ordinary Visitation, A.D. 1854. By R. I. Wilberforce, Archdeacon of the East Riding.—Annexed to,—Sermons on the Holy Communion. By R. I. Wilberforce, &c. Lond. 1854. sm. 8vo.

The presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist: a Sermon preached before the University in the Cathedral Church of Christ in Oxford, on the second Sunday after Epiphany, 1853. By the Rev. E. B. Pusey, D.D., Reg. Prof. of Hebrew, &c. Oxf. and Lond. 1853. 8vo.

doctrine, or to point out that it involves a self-contradiction in terms, because its nature will come under discussion hereafter, but only wish the reader to have at the outset a general idea of the point to be discussed. And Archdeacon Denison has justly said, that the best test whether a man holds what he considers to be the true doctrine of Scripture and our Church as to the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist, is, whether he maintains the doctrine that the Body and Blood of Christ are received in the Lord's Supper by the *unbelieving* communicant as well as by the *believing*. According as a man does or does not maintain the latter doctrine, so, the Archdeacon justly argues, must he *maintain* or *deny* the doctrine that in some way or other the real Body and Blood of Christ are present in or under or adjoined to the consecrated elements, so as to be orally eaten with them.

In direct contradiction therefore to the statement of our XXVIIIth Article that "the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is faith," the Archdeacon maintains, that it is received and eaten by the *mouth;* and in direct contradiction to the statement of our XXIXth Article, that the wicked "eat not the Body of Christ," "in no wise are partakers of Christ," "in the use of the Lord's Supper," he maintains, that the wicked receive the Body and Blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper as well as the faithful.

Now these two points formed the leading points of disagreement between our early Reformers and the Romanists in their disputes previous to the martyrdom of the former. These were *two of the more important of those points of doctrine connected with the Eucharist, to oppose which Archbishop Cranmer and Bishop Ridley laid down their lives.*

Opposition to the Popish doctrine on the Eucharist was, as is well known, the cause of almost all the martyrdoms that took place here at the period of the Reformation. And though it is quite true that the doctrine I am now about to consider differs in one point from that of transubstantiation, yet *the chief grounds of opposition* taken by our Reformers to the doctrine of transubstantiation *apply equally to the doctrine under review.* And that which is put forth by Archdeacon Denison as the true test of *orthodoxy* of doctrine on this subject is that which is especi-

ally repudiated by Cranmer and Ridley as the characteristic of *unorthodox* doctrine on the subject.

Thus, in Bishop Ridley's Disputation at Oxford, April 17, 1555, with the Popish party, one principal reason that he adduces against the Popish doctrine of the presence of Christ's Body and Blood in the elements is, that "it maketh precious "things common to profane and ungodly persons; for it casteth "that which is holy unto dogs, and pearls unto swine." "It "maketh precious things common to profane and ungodly "persons, and constraineth men to confess many absurdities. "For it affirmeth, that whoremongers and murderers, yea, and "(as some of them hold opinion) *the wicked and faithless*, "mice, rats, and dogs also, may receive the very real and "corporal Body of the Lord, wherein the fulness of the Spirit "of light and grace dwelleth: contrary to the manifest words "of Christ in six places and sentences of John vi."[1] This argument, of course, applies as much to Archdeacon Denison's doctrine as to that of the Romanists.

Again, in reply to the Popish objection, "Evil men do eat the very true and natural body of Christ: ergo, the true and natural body of Christ is on the altar," Bishop Ridley says,— "Evil men do eat the very true and natural body of Christ *sacramentally*, and no further;" and when pressed by precisely the same references to Scripture and the Fathers by the Romanists, as those now used by the Tractarians against their opponents, he insists that it is only "the sacrament of the body" that evil men eat.[2]

And of course, in the other parts of the Disputation, consistently with this view, (as the Archdeacon will admit), he maintains that the bread and wine are, in themselves, only signs or sacraments of the Body and Blood of Christ, that "the Body of Christ" is "communicated and given, *not to the bread and wine*, but to them which worthily do receive the sacrament;" and that "this sacrament hath a promise of grace, made to those that receive it worthily, because grace is given by it as by an instrument; *not that Christ hath transfused grace into the bread and wine.*"[3]

[1] Works, P. S. ed. pp. 198, 199. [2] Ib. pp. 246, 247. [3] Ib. pp. 240, 241.

So again Archbishop Cranmer—after having, in his great work on the Eucharist against Bishop Gardiner and the Romanists, laid it down as one of "THE FOUR PRINCIPAL POINTS" in which they "*varied*," that "evil men do eat the very body and drink the very blood of Christ,"[1] and contended "that evil men do *not* eat Christ's flesh, nor drink his blood; for the Scripture saith expressly, 'He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me and I in him,' which is not true of ill men,"[2]—in one of his Disputations at Oxford previous to his martyrdom, urges the Romanists with this argument,—"They which eat the flesh of Christ do dwell in him, "and he in them: But the wicked do not remain in him, nor "he in them: *Ergo*, The wicked do not eat his flesh nor drink "his blood." To this his Romish antagonist gives precisely the same reply as the Archdeacon gives to the same argument when used against himself, namely, that though both eat the Body and Blood of Christ, yet "*the effects* are diverse, life and death, which do follow the worthy and the unworthy eating thereof." But this Cranmer entirely rejects, maintaining that "wicked men can *in no wise* eat the flesh of Christ and drink his blood," quoting Augustine in support of his doctrine.[3]

And, like Ridley, consistently with this doctrine, he says in his work against Gardiner,—

"The Scripture is plain, and you confess also that it was bread that Christ spake of when he said, 'This is my body.' And what need we any other Scripture to encounter with these words, seeing that all men know that bread is not Christ's body, the one having sense and reason, the other none at all? Wherefore in that speech must needs be sought another sense and meaning than the words of themselves do give, which is (as all old writers do teach, and the circumstances of the text declare) that the bread is *a figure and sacrament of Christ's body*. And yet, as he giveth the bread to be eaten with our mouths, so giveth he his very body to be eaten *with our faith*. And therefore I say, that Christ giveth himself truly to be eaten, chewed and digested; but all is *spiritually, with faith*, NOT WITH MOUTH."[4]

And so in his Examination before the Commissioners previous to his martyrdom, we find him replying to the Romish

[1] Works, P. S. ed. Pt. i. p. 13.
[2] Ib. p. 12.
[3] Ib. pp. 426, 427.
[4] Ib. p. 15.

question, What is that body of Christ which is given in the Sacrament—"it is the same body which was born of the Virgin, "was crucified, ascended; but *tropically and by a figure*. And "so I say, *Panis est corpus* is a figurative speech, speaking "sacramentally; for it is a sacrament of his body;" and he adds afterwards, "Christ did use figurative speech in no place more than in his sacraments, and specially in this his supper."[1] Again, the Romanist pleads, Christ's "true natural and organical flesh is given to us to be eaten," which Cranmer *grants* (to the utter discomfiture of the Archdeacon's doctrine); but when the Romanist adds,—"Therefore we eat it with our mouth," Cranmer replies,—"*I deny it*. We eat it *through faith*." .... "I grant he took and gave the same true natural and organical flesh wherein he suffered; and yet he feedeth spiritually, and that flesh is received spiritually."[2] The Romanist again asks,—"When Christ said, 'Eat ye,' whether meant he, by *the mouth* or by *faith?*" To which Cranmer replies, "He meant that we should receive the body *by faith*, the bread by the mouth."[3] "*God worketh in his faithful, not in the sacraments.*"[4]

I have quoted these passages at the commencement of the discussion in order that the reader may at once see the importance of the point at issue, and how completely Archdeacon Denison is opposed (and *à fortiori* Archdeacon Wilberforce) in this matter to *the very truths for which our martyred Reformers laid down their lives*. I shall have hereafter to add many other passages to those above cited, not only from Cranmer and Ridley, but from the leading divines to whom we are indebted for the re-construction of our reformed Church on the accession of Queen Elizabeth.

But the doctrine of Archdeacon Wilberforce approaches still nearer that of the Romanists. Archdeacon Denison and Dr. Pusey appear to grant the presence of bread and wine in the elements after consecration, and therefore go little, if at all, beyond the high Lutheran doctrine; but Archdeacon Wilberforce is evidently not prepared to concede this. Holding, like the former, that the Body and Blood of Christ are so joined to the consecrated elements that they are eaten by *the mouth* of the communicants, and received by *all* the communicants, the faithful

[1] Works, P. S. ed. Pt. i. pp. 400, 401. [2] Ib. p. 403. [3] Ib. p. 404. [4] Ib. p. 417.

and the wicked alike, he also holds, that the nature of the bread and wine does not remain wholly unchanged, though he is unwilling to pronounce what is the character of the change that takes place in it. And how far he verges towards the full Romish doctrine of transubstantiation, will be seen when we come to prove in the next chapter the precise nature of the doctrine he has put forth, by extracts from his work.

Of these three writers, I must say that Archdeacon Denison alone seems practically impressed with the conviction that he is bound to prove his doctrine to be in accordance with the authorized Formularies of our Church. There are, no doubt, a few references made by Archdeacon Wilberforce and Dr. Pusey to passages in those Formularies as testifying in their favour, but the stress of the argument is made by them to rest upon their private deductions from the writings of the Fathers. With the inconsistency which has throughout marked the conduct of the Tractarian party, they denounce the right of private judgment in theory, and use it practically to a greater extent than their opponents. "Assuming," to use his own words, "the doctrine of the Church of England to be identical with that of the Fathers,"[1] Dr. Pusey proceeds to tell us what the doctrine of the Fathers is; and from his own impressions as to the true character of the doctrine of the Fathers, he jumps conveniently to the conclusion what is the doctrine of the Church of England. And so thoroughly convinced is he of the infallibility of his private judgment as to what is the doctrine of the Fathers, that he puts out of sight the fact that others, and our own Reformers among the number, have come to a different conclusion as to the Patristical doctrine on the subject; and boldly puts forth his own representation of the doctrine of the Fathers as proving what is the doctrine of the Church of England.

The reader will however, I think, agree with me in considering, that when we have definite statements of the doctrine of our Church in our authorized Formularies, this circuitous mode of ascertaining its doctrine is not only one very likely to cause great mistakes, but one which indicates some unwillingness to abide by the clear statements of our Formularies.

Archdeacon Wilberforce's mode of reasoning is precisely the

[1] Pref. to Serm.

same. Professing to have followed in his work on Baptism the Formularies and great divines of our Church, he avows at the outset his having pursued a different course in his work on the Eucharist. He tells us that, in the latter, his principle has been to refer first to Holy Scripture, and "when its meaning is disputed, reference is made to the Primitive Fathers, as providing the best means of settling the dispute;" and this he considers to be following the guidance of the celebrated Canon of 1571 relating to preachers. And hence throughout his work he almost ignores the existence of any determinations on the subject in the Formularies of our Church, and acts as if he was at perfect liberty to draw out a rule of faith for himself from Scripture and the Fathers, without any regard to the Articles he has subscribed.

Now if the point in question was one which had not been determined by the Articles and Formularies of our Church, there might have been some reason for the course here taken by the Archdeacon; or if he had chosen to reconsider the question of the orthodoxy of the Formularies he had subscribed, it was quite open to him to do so, and retain or relinquish his position in our Church according to the conclusion to which he might come. But to set aside those Formularies, and consider himself at liberty to run wild in the wilderness of the Fathers, and pick out a creed for himself, opposed to the doctrine of the Formularies he has subscribed, and justify himself in doing so by the direction of the Canon of 1571, is a course not easily reconcileable with the first principles of equity. And what is this Canon? The Archdeacon refers to it in the following words:—"The method therefore which has been adopted in "this work is that which was presented for the guidance of "preachers by the Convocation which imposed subscription to "the Articles. They were not to propound anything except "that which is consistent with the teaching of the Old and "New Testament, and that which the Catholic Fathers and "ancient Bishops have deduced from its teaching."[1]

I beg to recall to the Archdeacon's recollection the words that *immediately* follow those he has quoted:—

"And because those Articles of Christian religion, agreed upon by

[1] Doctr. of Euch. p. 2.

the Bishops, in the lawful and godly Convocation, and by the commandment and authority of our noble Princess Elizabeth assembled and holden, undoubtedly are gathered out of the holy books of the Old and New Testament, and in all points agree with the heavenly doctrine contained in them: because also the Book of Common Prayers, and the Book of the Consecration of Archbishops, Bishops, Ministers, and Deacons, contain nothing repugnant to the same doctrine, whosoever shall be sent to teach the people, shall not only in their preaching, but also by subscription, confirm the authority and truth of those Articles. He that doth otherwise, or troubleth the people with contrary doctrine, shall be excommunicated."[1]

As a minister of the Church of England he has no right to say,—The Church of England professes to agree with the Primitive Church in her doctrine, and I, in the exercise of my private judgment on the writings of antiquity, consider so and so to be the doctrine of the Primitive Church, and therefore such is the doctrine of the Church of England. The judgment of the Church of England on the leading doctrines of Christianity is to be found in her XXXIX Articles; and these, as the Canon just referred to shows, she considers to be in accordance with the doctrine maintained by the Primitive Church. This, no doubt, is a matter of opinion, and one in which the Romish Church disagrees with her, and in which any one who studies the writings of the Fathers may do the same, but her ministers are bound by her declared judgment. And therefore the very principle the Archdeacon has adopted is utterly irreconcileable with his obligations as a minister of our Church.

But he proceeds to exalt the testimony of the few early writers we possess, or rather the doctrine he has derived from them, into "the Church's judgment;" and tells us that "those "who take a higher view of the Church's judgment, and admit "it to possess 'authority in controversies of faith,' cannot dis- "pute its decision upon a point on which there was no "dissension."[2] Now that every national or local Church should possess within its own limits "authority in controversies of faith" is necessary for its own preservation, and we have the authority of so high a churchman as Leslie for saying, that these words as they stand in our Article mean only authority

[1] A Booke of certaine Canons, &c., Lond. 1571, p. 23. [2] Doctr. of Euch. p. 4.

"*ministerially* to determine controversies of faith;"[1] and that authority must be exercised among us by those to whom our laws have committed it. But as to "the Church's judgment," in the sense of the judgment of the whole Church, there is no such thing to be obtained on any of the points now in question, either as it respects the present or past period of the Church. To sit down and pick out of the few remains of antient authors we possess a certain doctrine, and then call it "the Church's judgment," is merely practising a deception upon the unlearned reader. Protestant writers infinitely better acquainted with the Fathers than Archdeacon Wilberforce, have drawn from their writings a doctrine entirely different from what he has deduced from them.

There is one other preliminary misstatement which I must notice. The Archdeacon says, that "the reference of our law on heresy to the four first Councils shows that the English Church supposes herself to accord in principle entirely with the Nicene."[2] Such is a specimen of the looseness and inaccuracy of statement with which the work abounds. The only ground which can be adduced in support of this statement is, that in the Act of Parliament of 1 Eliz. 1., constituting the High Commission Court, in order to prevent every trivial error being put down as "heresy," as in Popish times, it was enacted that they should not "adjudge any matter or cause to be heresy, "but only such as heretofore have been determined, ordered, "or adjudged to be heresy, by the authority of the Canonical "Scriptures, or by the first four General Councils, or any of "them," &c. This is literally the only foundation for the statement I have quoted. As it respects those very few special points of doctrine which have been expressly condemned as heresy by one of the first four General Councils, the High Commissioners were permitted to consider the same as heretical. And this (which, by the way, is only the provision of an Act of Parliament, applicable solely to the High Commission Court, long since defunct) proves, the Archdeacon tells us, that "the English Church supposes herself to accord in principle entirely with the Nicene"!!

[1] Of Private Judgment and Authority in Matters of Faith. See also Archbishop Tenison's Discourse concerning a Guide in Matters of Faith, p. 18.

[2] Doctr. of Euch. p. 5.

## CHAPTER II.

THE DOCTRINE OF ARCHDEACON DENISON, DR. PUSEY, AND ARCHDEACON WILBERFORCE ON THE SUBJECT OF THIS WORK SHOWN BY EXTRACTS FROM THEIR WRITINGS, WITH SOME REMARKS ON ITS TRUE NATURE.

I PROCEED in this chapter to show by extracts from the works of the three writers already mentioned what their views are on the doctrine of Christ's presence in the Eucharist. And I commence with a proof of the doctrine of Archdeacon Denison. In the Preface to his first Sermon, Archdeacon Denison quotes the following extracts from a published correspondence between himself and Bishop Spencer, as showing what the doctrine he maintains on the subject of the Holy Communion is:—

"I hold the doctrine of the 'Real Presence' as declared and taught by the Church of England to be this:—1st. *Negatively*, that there *is not* a corporal presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Sacramental Bread and Wine: That the Sacramental Bread and Wine remain still in their very natural substances, and therefore may not be adored. 2ndly. *Affirmatively*, that there *is* a Real Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Sacramental Bread and Wine, in a manner which, as Holy Scripture has not explained, the Church has not defined. That the Body and Blood of Christ, being really present in the Sacramental Bread and Wine, are *given* in and by the outward sign to *all*, and are *received* by all.

"That whether the Body and Blood of Christ be *given* and *received* 'unto life,' or 'unto death,' *this* depends upon the state of heart and mind of the receiver:—in other words, that the Body and Blood of Christ are present to *all objectively,—subjectively*, that they are present to the *faithful only*." (pp. 6, 7.)

"My language in my Letter of April 25 does mean what is,

always has been, and always will be, my meaning, and what you understand it to mean, viz., 'that in the Holy Communion the Body and Blood of Christ are RECEIVED BY ALL.'" (p. 8.)

"I had hoped that I had made it so clear that I hold the *Real* Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Sacramental Bread and Wine to be *purely* and *absolutely* a *Spiritual* Presence, as to have guarded myself definitely and effectually against being supposed to approach, however remotely, the confines of the doctrine of Consubstantiation." (p. 9.)

The confessed object of the Sermons is to maintain this doctrine, and the following passages in the Sermons and Notes will serve to show very clearly the doctrine maintained by Archdeacon Denison, who, it is evident, does not know what the doctrine called Consubstantiation is.

"I am here to-day to speak of the doctrine of the Real Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ *in the Sacramental Bread and Wine*."[1]

"The proposition which I have undertaken to prove from Holy Scripture is this:—That there is a Real Presence—not material, or as it is said, 'corporal,' but immaterial and spiritual—of the Body and Blood of Christ, in the consecrated Bread and Wine. And that the Body and Blood of Christ, being really present in the consecrated Bread and Wine, after an immaterial and spiritual manner—a manner which, as Holy Scripture has not explained, the Church has not defined—are given, therein and thereby, to *all*, and are *received* by *all* who come to the Lord's table. There are three parts of this proposition; 1. That the Body and Blood of Christ are really present in the consecrated Bread and Wine. 2. That the Body and Blood of Christ are really present in the consecrated Bread and Wine after a manner not material, or, as it is said, 'corporal,' but immaterial and spiritual. 3. That the Body and Blood of Christ, being really present, after an immaterial and spiritual manner, in the consecrated Bread and Wine, are therein and thereby *given* to *all*, and are *received* by *all* who come to the Lord's table."[2]

"The whole proposition might have been briefly stated thus:—That there is a Real Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the consecrated Bread and Wine."[3]

"Proposition III. is therefore, strictly speaking, not *a deduction from* the doctrine of the Real Presence, but *a part of* the doctrine itself. But supposing it to be *a deduction only*, then, if we *know*,

[1] Serm. i. p. 11. [2] Ib. pp. 17, 18. [3] Ib. p. 18.

as we certainly *do know*, that the Bread and Wine, retaining their very natural substances, become, in some ineffable way, the Body and Blood of Christ, through the consecrating power of the Priest—which is the plain teaching of Holy Scripture, and witnessed to as such by the undoubting testimony of the Church Catholic—it follows from Holy Scripture, and 'ex necessitate rei,'—seeing that we *do not know*, as we certainly *do not*, that the Presence thus vouchsafed is, under any circumstances, *withdrawn*, so that the Bread and Wine *cease to be* that which by consecration they have become—it follows, I say, from Holy Scripture and 'ex necessitate rei,' that the Body and Blood of Christ are *given* in and by the consecrated Bread and Wine to *all*, and are *received* by *all* who come to the Lord's Table." [1]

The statements in this passage as to the Bread and Wine *becoming* the Body and Blood of Christ through the consecrating power of the Priest, and the necessity of their *ceasing to be* what they have been thus made, by the *withdrawal* of the Presence from them, before *any one* who receives them can fail to receive in and by them the Body and Blood of Christ, will no doubt be observed.

The third proposition is also thus stated in Serm. i. p. 20:—

"That *to all* who come to the Lord's Table, to those who eat and drink worthily, and to those who eat and drink unworthily, the Body and Blood of Christ are *given;* and that *by all* who come to the Lord's Table, by those who eat and drink worthily, and by those who eat and drink unworthily, the Body and Blood of Christ are *received.*"

And it is immediately added,—

"The importance of Proposition III, which is the specific point at issue between Bishop Spencer and myself is, that it supplies an unfailing *test* of *what is meant* by any one who affirms of himself that he holds the doctrine of the Real Presence. It has been as supplying such a test, that I have proposed it to candidates for Holy Orders; not as a 'theological opinion,' which may or may not be held, but as a *test* of truth of doctrine and soundness of faith."[2]

"Those who regard the Holy Sacraments as Holy Scripture has delivered them, and the Church Catholic has witnessed to and taught them . . . . . will 'affirm constantly' that to maintain, that in the

[1] Serm. i. pp. 19, 20. [2] Ib. p. 20.

Holy Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, 'the outward part or sign' and 'the inward part or thing signified,' are, by the act of consecration, so joined together, that 'to receive the one is to receive the other,' (Wilberforce, Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist, p. 395) is not to maintain the '*opus operatum*.'"[1]

Again, in the second Sermon, it is stated, that the proposition which it is the main object of these Sermons to establish, is this:—"That *to all* who come to the Lord's Table, to those "who eat and drink worthily, and to those who eat and drink "unworthily, the Body and Blood of Christ are *given;* and "that *by all* who come to the Lord's Table, by those who eat "and drink worthily, and by those who eat and drink un-"worthily, the Body and Blood of Christ are *received*."[2] And again in p. 131,—"All who receive the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, receive the Body and Blood of Christ."

This proposition is of course accompanied by and made to rest upon the doctrine already advanced in the first Sermon, that there is after consecration such a presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the consecrated Bread and Wine, that all who receive the one necessarily receive the other. The attention of the reader is directed to the following statements of doctrine in this Sermon as to the nature of Christ's presence in the Eucharist.

"His [*i.e.* Christ's] Body and Blood are REALLY PRESENT "in the Holy Eucharist, 'under the form of Bread and "Wine'—*i. e.* PRESENT THINGS—though they be present "after a manner ineffable, incomprehensible by man, and "not cognisable by the senses." And on the words "present things" is added the following note:—"The real presence "of Christ in the Holy Eucharist is, therefore, not—as I "believe it is very generally supposed to be—the presence of "an *Influence* emanating from a *Thing absent*, but, the invisible "and supernatural *Presence* of a *Thing present:* of His Body "and His Blood present 'under the form of Bread and "Wine.'"[3]

This passage fixes the Archdeacon's view decisively to the notion of a real presence of the body, as a body; which is a *bodily*

[1] Serm. i., pp. 21, 22. [2] Ib. p. 57. [3] Serm. ii., p. 80.

or *corporal* presence. The Archdeacon may, if he pleases, urge, (as the Romanists urge) that he considers the body to be present only in a spiritual manner, (the reasonableness of which we shall consider hereafter,) but it is useless for him to deny, that the presence he contends for, being the presence of the body itself, is a *bodily* or *corporal* presence.

And this doctrine is followed out in the next page to the legitimate conclusion, that *adoration is due* to this presence in the elements. It is there expressly stated, that "*worship is due* "to the REAL, though invisible and supernatural, PRESENCE of "the Body and Blood of Christ in the Holy Eucharist, 'under "the form of Bread and Wine.'"[1] So that a person may kneel down before the bread and wine, and worship the presence of Christ in the bread and wine, and justify it on the ground that he is not worshipping the bread and wine, but that which is in the bread and wine!

"Is it meant that in both cases that Bread and that Cup— "that Holy Sacrament—are simply Bread and Wine after Conse- "cration as before? No,—it is confessed that this cannot be what "is meant; it is confessed upon all hands, that to those receiving "worthily they are certainly not simply Bread and Wine after con- "secration as before; that, after consecration, they are to *these* the "Body and the Blood of Christ."[2]

The reader will observe first the mistake in this passage as to *all holding* that the Bread and Wine are not simply Bread and Wine after consecration. It *is* held that, in themselves, they *are* simply Bread and Wine after consecration as they were before; but it is also held that they are *sacramentally* and *symbolically* the Body and Blood of Christ, and that they are so both to the faithful and the faithless; and that by God's blessing accompanying them they are effectual signs and symbols in the case of the faithful, who in receiving them are made partakers of the Body and Blood of Christ which they represent; while the wicked and unbelieving, through their lack of faith, receive nothing but the sacramental or symbolical Body and Blood of Christ.

[1] Sermon ii., p. 81. [2] Ib. p. 104.

Again:—

"THE ACT OF CONSECRATION MAKES THE REAL PRESENCE."[1]

"Oh priests of the Church of God, to us it is given to be the channels and the agents whereby the Holy Ghost doth thus make the Body and the Blood of Christ to be really, though invisibly and supernaturally, present under the form of Bread and Wine in the Lord's Supper—to us it is given to 'give' His Body and His Blood unto His people. . . . Oh priests and people of the Church of God, to us it is given to 'take and eat,' under the form of Bread and Wine, in the Lord's Supper, the Body and the Blood of Christ."[2]

"It is the act of consecration which gives continual effect, according to the command of Christ, to His institution of the Blessed Sacrament, and which makes IT, through the operation of the Holy Ghost, to be what He has promised IT shall be, viz., His Body and His Blood."[3]

The reader will observe these passages as showing the foundation upon which the main proposition defended by the Archdeacon rests; namely, that the priestly act of consecration effects *such a change* in the Bread and Wine, that all who receive them necessarily receive, irrespectively of their state of mind, the real Body and Blood of Christ.

He directly affirms, indeed, (as in a passage already quoted from his first Sermon), that the only way of escape from the doctrine of the reception of the Body and Blood of Christ by the unbelieving communicant is by "the theory that the Real Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ is *withdrawn* from those 'unworthily receiving' at the moment of their receiving."[4]

Again, he says that in the expression "the sacraments of the Body and Blood of Christ," the phrase "the sacraments" means "the outward parts or signs, and the inward parts or things signified, *so joined together by the act of consecration that to receive the one is to receive the other*," (p. 118.) which is repeated *verbatim*, p. 122. And "the sacrament," *as consisting* OF THESE TWO PARTS, "can be 'pressed with the teeth' 'carnally and visibly,' and 'unto condemnation.'"[5]

Again:—"The new nature thus given us in and by Holy

[1] Serm. ii., p. 107. The capitals are the Archdeacon's.
[2] Ib. pp. 107, 108.
[3] Ib. p. 116.
[4] Ib. pp. 116, 117. See also p. 138.
[5] Ib. p. 123.

"Baptism is renewed to us in the largest measure in which "the Holy Ghost bestows it here, and in a special manner, in "and by the use of the Holy Sacrament of the Lord's Supper; "wherein are really present 'under the form of Bread and "Wine,' are 'given' unto us, and 'taken and eaten' by us, "the Body and Blood of Christ."[1]

"All who receive the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper receive the Body and Blood of Christ."[2]

So that, according to the Archdeacon, when we partake of the consecrated elements, the Body and Blood of Christ are *eaten and drunk by us under the form of Bread and Wine.*

In his third Sermon he says,—

"Those then who affirm that the gift of the Body and Blood of Christ,—that which incorporates man in body and in soul into the human nature of Christ,—is *not received* by the unbelieving communicant; being doubtless the same persons who affirm that the gift of the NEW BIRTH—that which *makes* man to be 'a member of Christ, the child of God, and an inheritor of the Kingdom of Heaven,'—is *not received* by one baptized in unbelief; must be prepared to make herein a special exception, and to take the Holy Sacraments out of the analogy of the other gifts of God to man."[3]

In this passage the reader will observe, besides its testimony on the subject now before us, the witness it bears to the Archdeacon's doctrine on the other Sacrament. He holds, it seems, that baptism confers the gift of the New Birth even upon one baptized in unbelief! And so, in a note to Sermon 2, (p. 66.) he tells us, that "the test of what we mean, when we affirm "our belief in the doctrine of Regeneration in and by Holy "Baptism, is, whether we affirm that the *adult*, coming to Holy "Baptism in unbelief, impenitence, and hypocrisy, does, nevertheless, receive the gift of the New Birth in and by his Baptism. It is comparatively easy to affirm Regeneration of *all* "*infants* baptized. But the other is the test." And in a note in this place[4] he urges in defence of his doctrine,—"it will be remembered, that S. Paul speaks of *receiving grace, but not unto life.* 'We, then, as workers together with him, beseech you also, that ye *receive not the grace of God in vain*,' 2 Cor. vi. 1."

A more direct and unqualified assertion of the *ex opere*

[1] Sermon ii. p. 128. [2] Ib. p. 131. [3] Serm. iii. 160. [4] Ib.

*operato* effect of this sacrament could not be made. Its grace is distinctly stated to be given and received in all cases as the necessary effect of the act performed.

One more citation only need be added:—"What I hold and teach," says the Archdeacon, "is, That 'the Body and Blood of "Christ'—'the inward part, or Thing signified' of the blessed "Sacrament—is given to, and is received, unto condemnation, "by the unbelieving communicant."[1]

The Archdeacon's "Statement" was drawn up for the purpose of representing his doctrine in case of a judicial inquiry into it, and several of its Propositions are so ambiguously worded as to be capable of several meanings, orthodox and unorthodox. All of them in fact, when we compare them with the oft-reiterated doctrine of the Sermons, are evidently worded-to serve a purpose. It is not therefore worth notice, as being simply an attempt to throw dust into the eyes of those who might have to consider his case. But nevertheless the sixth proposition, when examined, will be found to contain, in itself, the sum and substance of the false doctrine put forth in the Sermons; namely, "That the sacrament—*i. e.*, 'the outward part, or sign,' and 'the inward part or Thing signified'—is given to, and is received by, all who communicate."

It is clear, then, that the three following propositions are maintained by Archdeacon Denison:—

1. That the act of consecration causes the Bread and Wine, though remaining in their natural substances, to have the Body and Blood of Christ really, though spiritually, "so joined" to them, that *the mouth of the communicant* when receiving one necessarily receives the other; or that, in his own words, "to receive the one is to receive the other."

2. That the Body and Blood of Christ are eaten and drunk in the Lord's Supper, "under the form of Bread and Wine."

3. That the unbelieving eat and drink the Body and Blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper, as well as the faithful.

And, of course, in connexion with these views he holds that adoration is due to Christ's Body and Blood as present in the Bread and Wine.

The reader will observe that in the first of these propositions

[1] Sermon iii. p. 174, *note*.

I have given full effect to the Archdeacon's reservations and limitations. He himself almost always speaks of the Presence as being *in* the Bread and Wine; but as he admits that the Bread and Wine remain in their natural substances, I have stated his doctrine in terms—which he has himself used elsewhere—which only commit him to the notion that the Bread and Wine and the Body and Blood of Christ are *so joined together*, as that all who eat and drink the one do necessarily in that act eat and drink the other.

Further, it will be observed by any one acquainted with the Sacramentarian controversy, that the Archdeacon has unconsciously committed himself to two assertions of a contradictory kind, if we understand his phraseology in the sense usually attached to it. For (as I shall show presently) the expression that the Body and Blood of Christ are received "under *the form* of Bread and Wine" is the Romish phrase for the doctrine of *transubstantiation*, the word "form" meaning the outward show or "accidents" of the Bread and Wine. But the first proposition maintains what is commonly called the doctrine of *consubstantiation*.

The Archdeacon has indeed imagined, that he has "guarded himself definitely and effectually against being supposed to approach, however remotely, the confines of the doctrine of consubstantiation," by asserting that the supposed presence of Christ's Body and Blood is a "spiritual" and "supernatural" presence, and not a material or visible one.[1] But neither the term "consubstantiation" nor "transubstantiation" is used to signify a material presence, or a substantial presence after a *natural* manner, but only that supposed real and substantial presence of Christ's Body after a *spiritual* and *supernatural* manner which he and Dr. Pusey and Archdeacon Wilberforce all maintain. Neither Romanists nor Lutherans have ever held a gross visible material presence, or a presence of the natural body after a *natural* manner. But the Romanists use the word "transubstantiation" to express their doctrine, because they suppose the material substance of the Bread and Wine to give place to a substantial presence of Christ's real Body and Blood after a supernatural manner.[2] And so the word "consubstan-

[1] See Serm. i. pp. 9, &c. [2] Concil. Trid. Sess. xiii. c. 1.

tiation," though not framed or used by the Lutherans themselves, was adopted to express the somewhat similar view of the followers of Luther, who held a real *substantial* presence of Christ's Body and Blood in, with, or under the Bread and Wine, but nevertheless never dreamed of holding a *material* presence. If there was a *material* presence of the Body and Blood joined to the Bread and Wine, there must be an increase in the visible bulk of the Bread and Wine, which evidently does not take place.

The doctrine of Archdeacon Denison as to the nature of the change that takes place in the consecrated elements, and the reception of the Body and Blood of Christ by the unbelieving as well as the faithful, is, in fact, precisely the same as that of the high Lutheran divines;[1] though he seems to be entirely ignorant of the fact, and even tells us that the notion of the reception by the unbelieving of the Body and Blood of Christ is "not consistent with Lutheran doctrine."[2] It is greatly to be regretted that he should have suffered himself to enter the lists on such a subject, while unacquainted with such common particulars relating to it.

The Lutherans, like Archdeacon Denison, repudiate the word "consubstantiation,"[3] on the ground that it expresses a local conjunction or physical commixture of Christ's Body and Blood and the Bread and Wine; but it does not necessarily express this any more than the word "transubstantiation" necessarily expresses a local presence of the Body and Blood of Christ after a natural manner *in the place of* the substance of the Bread and Wine; nor was it intended by the opponents of the Lutherans to express this, as they knew well what the views of the Lutherans were.

The doctrine of Dr. Pusey is precisely the same as that of Archdeacon Denison. He has, indeed, cautiously abstained from following it out to the conclusion so boldly advanced by both the Archdeacons in open defiance of the 29th Article, namely, that the wicked eat and drink the Body and Blood of

[1] See for instance Gerhard, Loci Theolog. Loc. 22. §§ 69, 98, & 231—236. ed. Cotta, tom. x. pp. 116, 165 et seq. & 388 et seq.

[2] Serm. ii. p. 66, *note*.

[3] See Gerhard, Loci Theolog. Loc. 22. §§ 69 & 98. ed. Cotta, tom. x. pp. 116, & 165, 166.

Christ in the Lord's Supper as well as the faithful; but he has distinctly maintained, that, by consecration, that effect is produced upon the Bread and Wine from which this conclusion clearly follows. He says,—"While the consecrated elements "remain in their natural substances, still, since our Lord says, "'This is my Body,' 'This is my Blood,' the Church of "England believes, that 'under the form of Bread and Wine,' "so consecrated, we 'receive the Body and Blood of our Saviour "Christ.' (Homil.) *And since we receive them, they must be there,* "*in order that we may receive them.*"[1] The *pretended* quotation from the Homilies in this passage I shall notice presently; but the doctrine of the Body and Blood of Christ being united to the consecrated Bread and Wine, is here clearly advocated.

Again, he quotes with approbation the following passage from Thorndike: "Upon this account when they [*i.e.* all Eccle-"siastical writers] speak of the elements, supposing the conse-"cration to have passed upon them, they always call them by "the name, not of their bodily substance, but of the Body and "Blood of Christ *which they are become.*"—"But this change "is not destructive to the bodily substance of the elements, "but *cumulative of them with the spiritual grace of Christ's Body* "*and Blood.*"[2] Again, he clearly intimates, that there is an "inward sacred Presence" *in the elements* by consecration,[3] and that "the elements after consecration" are "the vehicle of an Unseen Presence."[4] And he says of that doctrine of the Fathers, which he puts forward as what we ought to embrace, that "when they asserted, as they do continually, that *what is con-*"*secrated,* and what we receive, *are the Body and Blood of Christ,* "they mean this, not in any physical or carnal way, but "spiritually, sacramentally, Divinely, mystically, ineffably, "through the operation of the Word of Christ and of God the "Holy Ghost. But, in this meaning, they do speak of the "objective presence of the Body and Blood of Christ [that is, "*in or with the elements*] as following upon the consecration."[5] And lastly he says,—"Christ dwells in us in a *twofold* way, "*spiritually* and *sacramentally*. By his Spirit, He makes us the "temples of God; by his Body and Blood, He is to *our bodies* "also a source of life, incorruption, immortality."[6]

[1] Serm. p. 22. [2] Epilogue. B. 3, c. 4, §§ 27 & 45. [3] Serm. p. 45.
[4] Ib. p. 13. [5] Ib. pp. 46, 47. [6] Ib. p. 69.

So that it appears that Dr. Pusey holds that *in the Sacrament* Christ comes to *our bodies* and communicates to them his Body and Blood; which must be by an *oral reception* of that Body and Blood. But how this reception can be "a source of life, incorruption, and immortality" to our bodies, when we know that our bodies are all doomed to death, corruption, and mortality, I cannot quite understand. And I read that Christ *shall quicken our mortal bodies* BY HIS SPIRIT.

But, to let this pass for the present, the reader will here see that the doctrine of Dr. Pusey is *identical* with that of Archdeacon Denison, and therefore must stand or fall with it.

The doctrine of Archdeacon Wilberforce approaches still nearer to that of Rome. That the bread and wine remain unchanged, he does not admit, but otherwise supports the doctrine put forth by Archdeacon Denison. Indeed Archdeacon Denison himself claims this to be the case. He says:—

"The proof of proposition 1,—'That the Body and Blood of Christ are really present in the consecrated bread and wine,'—has been so fully and unanswerably stated in the writings of two great living authorities, viz., by Archdeacon Wilberforce, in his 'Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist,' lately published; and by Dr. Pusey, in his 'Sermon preached before the University of Oxford on the Second Sunday after the Epiphany' of the present year [i.e. 1853],—that I gladly and thankfully refer to these writings rather than make what would be either a reproduction of their statements, or a greatly inferior statement of my own."[1]

And he correctly states, that his third proposition, as to *all* communicants receiving equally the Body and Blood of Christ, "is *directly affirmed in terms* by Archdeacon Wilberforce, as the "undoubted doctrine of Holy Scripture, witnessed to by the "Church Catholic, in at least twenty passages of his work:— "pp. 71, 72, 120, 142-3, 145, 173, 180-1, 200, 219, 221, 222, "223, 224, 259, 272, 289, 290, 292 (*bis*), 297, 307, 395."[2]

But I will give, as in the former cases, the leading passages in Archdeacon Wilberforce's work on which I ground my proof of his doctrine.

"The *sacramentum* and the *res sacramenti*" "are so united "that they must needs go together; and whoso receives the one

[1] Serm. i. pp. 24, 25. [2] Ib. pp. 20, 21.

"receives the other."[1] "The *res sacramenti* (according to the "Church-system) is partaken by all."[2] "The *sacramentum* and "the *res sacramenti* go together; every one who receives one, "receives the other."[3]

And this presence of Christ's Body in the elements, though a "supernatural presence," is "the *essential* or *substantial* presence of Christ's Body."[4]

"He is present himself, and not merely by his influence, "effects, and operation; by that *essence*, and in that *substance*, "which belongs to him as the true Head of mankind. And "therefore he is *really* present; and gives his body to be the "*res sacramenti*, or thing signified."[5] And it is His "natural" body that is present,[6] though in a "supernatural" way, a way that makes its presence not an object to the senses.[7]

And it has to a certain extent "*place and shape*," according to Archdeacon Wilberforce, for he says,—

"There is one way in which our Lord's Body may be said to be present *with form and place* in the Holy Eucharist. For there is a connexion between the *sacramentum* and *res sacramenti*, and form and place belong to the first, though they do not belong to the second. So that though the *res sacramenti*, in itself, has neither place nor form, yet it has them in a manner through the *sacramentum*, with which it is united. Christ's Body therefore may be said to have a form in this Sacrament, namely, the form of the elements, and to occupy that place through which the elements extend. As the spirit may be said to be present in that place where the body is situated, and as light may be said to assume the shape of the orifice through which it passes, so it may be said that the *res sacramenti* borrows place and shape from the *sacramentum*, with which it is united by consecration."[8]

And hence he expressly declares, that "Christ's Body is *orally* received" by the communicants.[9]

And though he speaks of the "outward part," or the Bread and Wine, as remaining so completely that it is "not only an object to the sight and the touch," but "retains that power of

[1] Doctr. of Euch. p. 120. [2] Ib. pp. 142, 143. [3] Ib. p. 223. See also p. 222.
[4] Ib. pp. 165—173. [5] Ib. p. 178. [6] Ib. p. 391.
[7] Ib. pp. 405, 407, &c. [8] Ib. pp. 164, 165. [9] Ib. p. 409.

nourishment which is our other sign of its sensible existence,"[1] yet he distinctly intimates that even this "outward part" does not remain "wholly unaltered."[2] And he meets the difficulty arising from the statement of our XXVIIIth Article, that "transubstantiation, or the change of the substance of Bread and Wine in the Supper of the Lord," is "repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament," &c., by saying that the word "substance" is there used of the elements only as they are "an object to the senses," and therefore he thinks that the difference between the Church of England and Aquinas with the schoolmen, is merely "a verbal contradiction," from the different way in which they used the word "substance." "The Aristotelian philosophy," he tells us, "on which their expressions [i. e. "those of the schoolmen] were moulded, divided all objects into "the *accidental* part, which was an *object to the senses*, and the "*substantial*, which was an object only to the mind. By sub-"stance therefore in the Holy Eucharist, they understood not "the *sacramentum*, but the *res sacramenti*." But, "when "the Church of England denies that the substance of bread "and wine is changed in the Holy Eucharist, she refers to "the *sacramentum*, or *that which is an object to the senses*," or, in other words, to that which the schoolmen called *the accidents*. The Council of Trent, however, he says, used the word "substance" in the same sense as the schoolmen, and therefore "when the Church of Rome speaks of change of "substance, there is no reason why she may not be understood "to refer to the *res sacramenti*, or that which is not an object to "the senses." And so after all, notwithstanding our Church's testimony against "transubstantiation, or the change of the *substance* of bread and wine," she and the Church of Rome may be thoroughly agreed upon the point, for they may only be playing at cross purposes by understanding the word substance in different senses. Our Church, meaning by *substance* only *the accidents*, may quite agree with the Church of Rome, which holds that the accidents do remain, and are not changed. "If," says the Archdeacon, "the question were understood in this way, the contradiction would be verbal, rather than real;

[1] Doctr. of Euch. p. 288. [2] Ib. pp. 294, 295.

in language and not in thought." And then changing his supposition into positive assertion, he roundly declares that this was the notion "which the words of the Article really censure."[1]

So that our martyrs shed their blood on the most ridiculous misunderstanding that ever existed, for notwithstanding all their long disputes with the Romanists, both sides really meant the same thing, and never found it out; and it was left to those who lived three centuries afterwards, to discover that in the very Article drawn up to oppose the Romish doctrine, the very same doctrine substantially was *meant* as that held by the Romanists themselves! Both held that there was no change in the accidents of the bread and wine (which the Archdeacon, with the Romanists, holds to be the *sacramentum* in spite of Cranmer, Jewel, &c. &c.), and both held that in the consecrated elements were the Body and Blood of Christ. But there is just this difference between the two, that the Romanists hold with Aquinas, "that the substance [in the school sense of the word] "of our Lord's Body and Blood supersedes that of the Bread "and Wine, while, so far as the senses go, [i. e. so far as "respects the *accidents* of form, colour, taste, &c.] the latter "remain wholly unaltered;" but our divines have not committed themselves to this particular mode of Christ's Presence. For as to this particular "mode in which our Lord's Presence is brought about," namely, by what the schoolmen call the substance of his Body and Blood *superseding* that of the Bread and Wine, "there can be no NECESSITY," adds the Archdeacon,

"For admitting this expression of the *manner* in which our Lord's Presence is brought about, unless it is commended to us by some later authority, to which we are bound to submit. And therefore, while it is accepted by those who admit the authority of the Council of Trent, it is not accepted by English Churchmen, by whom that Council is not recognized. THEY WITHHOLD THEIR ASSENT from this account of the *manner* in which our Lord's Presence is brought about in the Holy Eucharist, and allow nothing but that in which all parties in the ancient Church were accordant. They hold, of course, as our Article declares, and as Aquinas would not have denied, that according to that popular sense of the word *substance*, which implies it to be an object to the senses of men, [i. e. which makes it mean the *accidents* of a thing] the substance

[1] Doctr. of Euch. pp. 126—128.

of the elements remains unchanged. [And this the Romanists hold also, so that the Article must have been written by men profoundly ignorant of the Romish doctrine on the subject.] But in reference to that more subtile explanation, which was designed by Aquinas, they SIMPLY WITHHOLD THEIR JUDGMENT, and affirm nothing respecting the Holy Eucharist but that which was affirmed by the whole Church, both in the East and West, during the first seven centuries of its existence, [according to Archdeacon Wilberforce's *private judgment* on the matter]."[1]

So that whether the substance of the Bread and Wine *vanishes*, and the Body and Blood of Christ, present after a spiritual and supernatural manner, *succeed in its place*, or whether that substance *remains*, and the Body and Blood are present *with* it, the Archdeacon thinks himself at liberty to doubt. That is, between the doctrines of transubstantiation and consubstantiation he has not quite made up his mind; but clearly from his own statements he inclines to the former.

Now this certainly goes one step beyond what Archdeacon Denison has yet ventured openly to state, but is nothing more than what the statements he has already made may fairly lead us to expect. And when we find him referring to Archdeacon Wilberforce's work in the terms he has used,[2] we must either suppose that he has hastily praised statements of the nature of which he is ignorant, or that he sympathises with them.

But it must be added, that we may have a complete view of the Archdeacon's system, that he maintains, that "the process by which Christ's Body and Blood act upon the receiver, is *spiritual* and not *physical*."[3] He holds, that it is only through *the soul* that the Body and Blood of Christ act upon man, and that "faith is essential if the *res sacramenti* is to be the spiritual nourishment of the soul."[4] Though the Body and Blood of Christ, therefore, are received by the mouth, they do not affect the body except through the soul, and the soul cannot "profit by its nourishment, except it lives."[5]

In this way, therefore, he brings in the office of faith; and thus endeavours to account for the adverse language of some of the Fathers; as, for instance, of Augustine's expression, "crede et manducasti;" but clearly without success, because he

[1] Doctr. of Euch. pp. 294—6. [2] Serm. i. p. 25. [3] Doctr. of Euch. pp. 404, 405.
[4] Ib. pp. 406 et seq. [5] Ib. p. 414.

maintains that the eating is with *the mouth*, though no *benefit* arises from it except through the operation of faith, whereas with Augustine the eating is the act of faith. And in our own XXVIIIth Article it is still more clearly laid down in opposition to his view, that "*the mean* whereby the Body of Christ is *received and eaten* in the Supper is *faith*."

And I am bound to add, that these views are carried out in Archdeacon Wilberforce's work to other points, so directly and offensively opposed to the express statements of the Church of England in her authorized Formularies, particularly as to the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, that it is difficult to understand how its author can possibly retain his position in the Church of England (considering the oaths and subscriptions by which he is bound,) consistently with any regard for his own character. But on the present occasion I must not diverge to these points.

It is desirable, however, to point the attention of the reader to the fact, that if his doctrine of the Real Presence of Christ's Body and Blood in the consecrated elements is proved not to be the doctrine of the Church of England, his notion of that Body and Blood being sacrificially offered up to God in the Eucharist necessarily *falls with it*. This he himself admits, for he says that "the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice can only ally "itself with a system which supposes that the Holy Eucharist "[by which he means *the elements*] consists of a *res sacramenti* "as well as a *sacramentum;* IT NEEDS THE DOCTRINE OF THE "REAL PRESENCE AS THE BASIS ON WHICH IT IS TO BE "BUILT."[1]

The doctrine, therefore, of Archdeacon Wilberforce on this whole subject cannot be distinguished in any point of any moment from that of the Church of Rome. By an interpretation of our XXVIIIth Article, the nature of which I shall not characterize, he attempts to prove that any difference that may exist between our Church and the Roman on the nature of the Real Presence, is verbal rather than real, and then thinks himself justified in asserting that all which our Church has done on the question of the Romish doctrine of the Real Presence has been to "withhold her judgment" on it; in which case he is of

[1] Doctr. of Euch. p. 347.

course quite at liberty to hold it, and to all appearances avails himself of that supposed liberty.

Thus, therefore, do we find the Romanists speaking of his work:—

"We cannot but rejoice to find Mr. Wilberforce establishing the whole system of Catholic doctrine with respect to the Holy Eucharist, as at present received by the Church in communion with the See of Rome, by an appeal to the testimony of the earliest ages of the Church."[1]

"Our author has evidently (though, perhaps, unconsciously) allowed the dogmatical teaching of the Council of Trent to have considerable influence upon the matter of his statements, and his manner of expression."[2]

"The next chapter is devoted to a detailed proof that the real objective benefit in and through the Holy Eucharist is the presence of Christ himself.....and he has come.....to an acceptance of the very positions laid down with so much force and beauty by the Council of Trent."[3]

"By real, as he shows in detail, he means *as the Church herself teaches*, not a material, but a supernatural presence, such, in kind, as properly belongs to a glorified body, though infinitely, of course, transcending it on account of the hypostatic union of his human to his divine nature."[4]

"It is the ancient Catholic doctrine of the Church, set forth once more in almost the very terms of the Tridentine definitions, by an authority wholly external too, and independent of, the Council of Trent."[5]

"We may briefly sum up the teaching of Mr. Wilberforce in this work, by saying that with the exception of an occasional and manifestly unintentional inaccuracy of expression, he teaches the doctrine of the Catholic Church."[6]

"We now proceed from the sacramental to the sacrificial part of the Holy Eucharist; and we rejoice to be able to state, that here too Archdeacon Wilberforce's teaching is distinct. It sets forth clearly the sacred doctrine of the Mass."[7]

In the same Review, pp. 62—64, is shown the opposition of Archdeacon Wilberforce's views to the Formularies of the English Church.

Now, before I proceed to make any remarks on the nature

[1] Dubl Rev. for April 1854, p. 48. [2] Ib. p. 49. [3] Ib. p. 60. [4] Ib. p. 65.
[5] Ib. pp. 73, 74. [6] Rambler for Jan. 1854, p. 55. [7] Ib. p. 56.

of this doctrine, there are two preliminary points on which I would in the first place offer a few observations. One is, the way in which the authors whose works we are reviewing have confounded two things which are entirely distinct, namely, the real presence of Christ in the Sacrament or rite to the worthy receiver, and His real presence in the consecrated elements; as also a *real spiritual* with a *real bodily* presence. The other is, the mistake they have made in quoting certain words as contained in our Formularies which are not only not contained in them (being merely an Advertisement inserted in the first edition of the first Book of the Homilies, published before the doctrine of Transubstantiation was given up, and copied by subsequent printers), but were the peculiar Popish formula used to express that doctrine of Transubstantiation—or the change of the bread and wine themselves into the Body and Blood of Christ—which Archdeacon Denison and Dr. Pusey profess to repudiate.

*First*, then, they have confounded two things entirely distinct, the real presence of Christ in the Sacrament or rite to the worthy receiver, and His real presence in the consecrated elements; as also a *real spiritual* with a *real bodily* presence. Thus, Archdeacon Denison commences his sermons by telling us, "I am here to-day to speak of the doctrine of the Real Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Sacramental Bread and Wine;" and then proceeds in other parts of his sermons to speak of the point in question as that of "the doctrine of the Real Presence,"[1] as if the two things were identical, whereas there is a most important difference between them. There may be a real presence of Christ, even in the sense attributed to the words by the Archdeacon, *in the Supper*, though it be not in the elements. And, in the true sense of the words, our Church no doubt holds a real spiritual presence of Christ in the sacrament or rite to every faithful communicant, but not in the sacramental bread and wine. The true "doctrine of the real presence" is held by Archdeacon Denison's opponents.

And it may be well here to state in few words the great point of distinction between the doctrine of Archdeacon Denison and that maintained in the Formularies of the Church of England, and, speaking generally, by all her great divines. The former doctrine is, that the Body and Blood of Christ are so joined to the Bread and

[1] Serm. i. pp. 12, 13, 17, &c.

Wine by the act of consecration that *all*, whether faithful or faithless, who eat and drink the bread and wine, do in that act eat and drink the Body and Blood of Christ; the Bread and Wine and the Body and Blood of Christ thus coalescing and becoming one; —the latter is, that though the act of consecration makes the bread and wine sacred symbols or sacraments of the Body and Blood of Christ, in the participation of which by the faithful there is vouchsafed a real spiritual presence to the soul of the Body and Blood of Christ, which are verily and indeed received and spiritually eaten and drunk to the soul's health, yet that the presence of the Body and Blood of Christ is not communicated to (though in the case of the faithful *connected with the participation of*) the bread and wine, and His Body and Blood are not given to, or partaken of by, the faithless. In short, it is a real presence to the receiver and not to the elements. If we wish to understand the real doctrine of the divines either of antient or modern times, it is absolutely necessary not only to note very accurately the nature of their phraseology, as a slight difference in this respect may indicate a vast difference in the doctrine maintained, but also the different senses in which the same phrases, such as "real presence," "sacramental union," &c., were used.

And if we wish to inquire further what is the precise nature of this real presence to the receiver, then it must be remembered, that if we seek to lay down what is the doctrine of our Church respecting it, we must not be more definite or exclusive than she has been in her statements on the subject. In this case, as in some others, she has wisely forborne to give any precise definition, leaving a scope for some difference of opinion on a mysterious subject. She has rather placed *limits* on each side to the doctrine she allows to be held, than sought to force all to adopt precisely the same view. On the one side, she has clearly excluded the notion that the Body and Blood of Christ are so connected with the consecrated Bread and Wine as to be orally eaten and drunk with them (either according to the Romish or any other view of the matter), by declaring that *the mean* whereby we eat and drink the Body and Blood of Christ is *faith*.[1] And further, by the Rubric at the end of the Communion Service repudiating the doctrine of the corporal

[1] Art. 28.

presence in the Lord's Supper, *because it is against the truth of Christ's natural body that it should be in more than one place at the same time,* she has forbidden the doctrine that there is a presence of Christ's natural body in the Supper, either in a natural or supernatural or spiritual manner, and either adjoined to the elements *or distinct from them.*[1] On the other hand, she has excluded what is called the Zuinglian view, by declaring

[1] This Rubric was not inserted in the Prayer Book of Elizabeth, though it had been in the second Book of Edward VI.; and it remained excluded from the Prayer-Book till the last Review in 1662, when it was re-inserted with a slight alteration, which I shall notice hereafter. The reason for this exclusion may have been that it was not felt desirable to be rigidly strict at that time against *all* notions of a bodily presence. The great point was to exclude the carnal notion of an *oral* eating of the Body of Christ present *in the elements*, and all the evil consequences resulting from such a doctrine; and to establish the doctrine that "*the mean* by which the Body of Christ was eaten was *faith.*" The notion of a bodily presence in the Supper to the faith of the receiver was one of a more harmless speculative nature, and therefore was left open to those who chose to entertain it. But the revival in our present Prayer Book of the Rubric of the second Prayer Book of Edward VI. clearly puts an end even to this doctrine. For, as the able Roman Catholic writer, Abraham Woodhead, justly says, "This reason [namely, that the same body cannot be at the same time in different places] seems necessarily to exclude the *real* and *essential* presence [*i.e.* in the sense of a *substantial* presence] as well as *corporal* and *natural.*" "If they say, that Christ's Body is really or essentially present in the Eucharist, but they mean not to the elements, but to the receiver; and that not to his body, but to his soul; yet if they affirm it as much or as far present to the soul, as others do to the signs . . . do not the same objections, absurdities, &c. (concerning Christ's being both really and essentially in Heaven, and in the place where the Communion is celebrated) with which they afflict others for making it present with the signs, return upon themselves, for making it present with the receiver? For if it be possible that the Body of Christ, now sitting at the right hand of God in heaven, can, notwithstanding this, be present in our soul, or in our heart, in such a place on earth, so may it *under*, *with*, or *instead of* bread in the same place; unless we say that they affirm not the real presence to the soul, which the others do to the bread. . . . If they say that Christ's Body is really or essentially present in the Eucharist, but they mean *spiritually*, not *naturally*, or not *corporally*; so say others, both Romanist and Lutheran; *i.e.* not with the usual accidents or qualities accompanying (where is no supernatural effect) the nature or essence of a body: but if they will extend *spiritually* so far as that it shall imply Christ's Body to be there really and essentially, yet not to be there *quoad naturam* or *essentiam suam*; or Christ's Body to be there, not *quoad corpus*; this is by a distinction to destroy the *thesis*. Again, if they say really and essentially there present, but not *locally*; so say the Lutheran and Roman doctors," &c., &c. (Woodhead's Two Discourses concerning the Adoration of our Blessed Saviour in the Holy Eucharist. Oxf. 1687, 4to., pp. 18, 24.)

These remarks are perfectly true. The denial that our Saviour's body can be in two places at the same time, is a denial that there can be any real bodily presence of our Saviour at all in the Eucharist, either in the elements or apart

that sacraments are "effectual signs of grace,"[1] and that the Body and Blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper,[2] and other similar testimonies.

But between these two extremes there are no doubt many different shades of view, and consequently we find a difference in the language held by our divines on the subject. By some of them we find the doctrine of the Real Presence maintained in language which others have been unable to receive; particularly at that period when the Rubric which now occurs at the end of the Communion Service was excluded from the Prayer Book; but still if we examine their statements *as a whole*, we shall find that (even including the authors who wrote when the Rubric was excluded) the Real Presence they advocate is a presence *to the receiver, not to the bread and wine;* a presence no doubt connected, in the case of the faithful recipient, with the reception of the bread and wine, but yet *distinct from them*, and not vouchsafed to the unbelieving communicant. And however strong may be the language in which such a view is conveyed, supposing it not absolutely to oppose the Ru-

from them. And the supposition of the real presence of the body in a supernatural way is a mere subterfuge, resorted to for the purpose of escaping the condemnation of the Rubric, but in vain, because such a presence *is* a *corporal* presence. The restoration, therefore, of this Rubric to our Prayer Book at the last revision, precludes those who have subscribed it from holding *any* bodily presence of Christ at all in the Eucharist, even apart from the consecrated elements. While it was excluded, such a view might no doubt be held by our divines, and some of them, perhaps, who lived at that time, did maintain it. *But even these give no countenance to the doctrine opposed in this work*, because that doctrine is, that *the presence is by priestly consecration* IN THE ELEMENTS, *and to be adored as in the elements;* a notion which was decidedly opposed, as I shall show hereafter, by those who held the highest doctrine of the Real Presence ever maintained in our Reformed Church. And this is distinctly admitted by the Roman Catholic author just cited, even when endeavouring to show how near these authors came to the Roman Catholic doctrine of the Real Presence. He is obliged to admit that their notion of the Real bodily presence was that it was a presence *to the receiver* but *not to the elements.* (See work already cited, in various places; and his Compendious Disc. on Euch. Oxf. 1688, p. 30 et seq. and App. 2, p. 212.) And his accuracy in this respect (though I do not of course hold myself pledged by this reference to the correctness of all his representations on the subject) forms a striking contrast to the way in which these writers have been quoted of late, as if they favoured the doctrine here opposed.

[1] Art. 25. [2] Catechism.

bric on the subject, we have no right to charge it with being contrary to the declared doctrine of the Church of England. While on the other hand there are shades of doctrine in the other direction equally admissible in our Church. And to attempt to narrow these limits, would savour more of selfishness than of the spirit of Christianity. But the maintenance of those limits is absolutely essential to the preservation of the purity of the Christian faith in our Church.

But the authors whom we are here controverting refuse to attach any other notion to the phrase Real Presence than that of a substantial presence of Christ's Body, though after a supernatural manner, that is, in fact, a *bodily* or *corporal* presence; which the Rubric rejects. Any other mode of presence they peremptorily denounce as *not* a *real* presence. But I hope we may be permitted to prefer, on this point, the judgment of a large proportion of our best divines, who use the words in a different sense, to the *ipse dixit* of Archdeacons Wilberforce and Denison, and Dr. Pusey, and to think that this phrase (whatever sense others may choose to attach to it) may fitly be used to describe the doctrine we maintain.

The only fair way of judging what is the doctrine of the Church of England, and to what the clergy of that Church have pledged themselves, on the question of the nature of Christ's Presence in the Eucharist, is by PUTTING TOGETHER, *and comparing with one another,* the various dogmatic statements she has made on the subject. Thus, her statements in the authorized Formularies we have subscribed are, that "the "Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper, only "after a heavenly and spiritual manner; and the mean whereby "the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is "faith,"[1] and that there is no "corporal presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood," because "the natural Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ are in Heaven, and not here; it being against the truth of Christ's natural body to be at one time in more places than one;"[2] and yet that the Body and Blood of Christ "are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper."[3]

[1] Art. 28. [2] Rubric at end of Comm. Serv. [3] Catechism.

These statements must be combined together to enable us fairly to judge what is the doctrine of our Church on the subject. The last, taken alone, might be interpreted in a sense entirely opposed to the meaning of the other two, and that without any strain upon the words. But it would be obviously unjust to say, that such a sense expressed the doctrine of the Church of England, and obviously unfair for one who had subscribed *all* these statements to give, as a minister of our Church, such a sense to the passage. The Article maintains that the Body and Blood of Christ are received only by faith, and therefore not by the mouth of the communicant, and consequently they are certainly not in or under or substituted for the consecrated elements; and the Rubric asserts, that there is no substantial presence of the natural Body of Christ at all in the Supper; and therefore the words "verily and indeed taken and received" do not mean that the substantial Body and Blood of Christ, whether we suppose them present in a natural or a supernatural way, are received by the communicant. On the other hand, though, by the Article, the reception is determined to be an act of faith, and by the Rubric we are precluded from holding a presence of Christ's natural body in the Supper, yet the words of the Catechism show, that our Church maintains, that the Bread and Wine are not mere inoperative signs, serving only the purpose of memorials to us of the death of Christ, but that by partaking of them *the faithful* do really obtain communion with the Body and Blood of Christ, and partake of them to their souls' health.

The same confusion that we have had to notice in the phraseology of Archdeacon Denison on this point, is also observable in the works of Archdeacon Wilberforce and Dr. Pusey. And the fact that this ambiguous phraseology enables them to quote as maintaining their views, the language of divines who altogether dissented from them, renders us justly suspicious of the motives which induce them to do so. Thus a cursory reader would suppose that the great object of Archdeacon Wilberforce's work was to maintain the doctrine of "our Lord's Real Presence *in the Holy Eucharist*," for this is the phrase he constantly uses, leading his readers, throughout his whole work, to suppose that this doctrine is denied by all who deny a bodily presence *in the*

*elements*.[1] Whereas the Archdeacon is perfectly well aware that "our Lord's Real Presence *in the Holy Eucharist*" is and has been firmly maintained by multitudes who would most earnestly and strenuously oppose the doctrine he is seeking to establish under that phrase. The only *honest* course for the Archdeacon and those who think with him, is to use a phrase which truly expresses the doctrine he is attempting to inculcate, namely, that of a "substantial Presence of Christ's Body" (to use his own words) *made to coalesce with the elements by consecration*.

So again Dr. Pusey writes as if he were defending "the presence of Christ in the Eucharist" against those who denied it.

I might easily add others who have written in the same way, and have by this means contrived to delude many minds by extracts from our great divines, apparently supporting the doctrine here controverted, while the real views of those divines were entirely opposed to the doctrine in support of which they are cited.

I am constrained to say, that these are not weapons characteristic of men maintaining the cause of truth.

These remarks will, I hope, enable the reader to see more clearly the real nature of the subject about to be discussed. He will observe, that of those who hold the doctrine of a real *bodily* presence of Christ, of a spiritual and supernatural kind, in the Lord's Supper, there are three classes. (1) The Romanists, who hold that the real substantial Body and Blood of Christ, present in a spiritual manner, are *substituted for* the substance of the Bread and Wine in the consecrated elements; (2) the Lutherans, who hold that they are *united to* the Bread and Wine by consecration, so as to be in or under them, and thus partaken of by *all* the communicants; (3) some of the Reformed, whose words seem to imply, that they are present in the Supper, and there given to the worthy communicant on his participation of the consecrated elements, but that they are *not united to the consecrated elements themselves*—a doctrine which enables them to reject the notion that they are partaken of by *all* the communicants, wicked as well as faithful.

[1] He expressly charges them with this in some places, declaring that "they either deny that there exists any *res sacramenti* at all, or deny, at all events, its presence IN THE ORDINANCE." (p. 369.) There is no escape here for the Archdeacon from the charge either of most culpable ignorance or more culpable misrepresentation.

Now, *during the exclusion of the Rubric,* this last view was not perhaps directly opposed to any statement in the Formularies of our Church; but even if any of our divines of that period have expressed themselves in a way which would seem to imply a doctrine of this kind, all they meant probably was, what Archbishop Cranmer meant, when using language which might be so interpreted; and what that was, he himself tells us in his Preface to his Answer to Bishop Gardiner. Such language might only mean a presence like that of the sun, which might be called a substantial presence, not as indicating that the substance of the sun's body was on the earth, but only the influence emanating from it; and this illustration is adopted in one of the Reformed Confessions which uses language such as I am now speaking of.

But this view, however untenable, is very different from that here controverted. It does not, like it, labor under the objection of giving the Body and Blood of Christ to the wicked; it does not, like it, lead men to worship a supposed existence of the Body and Blood of Christ in, or under, or under the forms of, the Bread and Wine; it does not, like it, exalt the priest into a "maker" and "dispenser" of the Body and Blood of Christ. It does not lead to other evil consequences which result from the doctrine here opposed; which, even apart from any consideration of the Rubric, is altogether repugnant to the statements of the Formularies of our Church.

And, since the re-introduction of the Rubric, even this third view is certainly not consistent with that subscription to the Prayer-Book required by the Canon.

Yet, nevertheless, our Church has not laid aside the doctrine of *the Real Presence,* in that sense of the words which the subject demands, and in which a large proportion of the best divines of our Church have used it. And I shall here give from one of them (Dr. Aldrich, Dean of Christ Church in 1687,) an illustration of the way in which it is used by them, and what they understand by it.

"The natural body of our Blessed Saviour comes under a twofold consideration in the Eucharist:—1. *As a body dead;* under which notion we are said to eat it in the Sacrament, and to drink the *blood as shed;* as appears by the words of the Institution, 'Take

and eat, this is my body which is given or broken for you;' 'Drink ye all of this, for this is my blood which is shed for you:' in which words (as Mr. Bradford long ago observed, Acts and Monum. p. 1611.) what God has joined we are not to put asunder. 2. *As a glorified body;* in which condition it now sits at the right hand of God, and shall there continue till the restitution of all things, imparting grace and influence, and all the benefits purchased by the sacrifice of the dead body, to those that (in the Holy Eucharist most especially) are through faith and by the marvellous operation of the Holy Ghost incorporated into Christ; and so united to him that they 'dwell in Christ and Christ in them; they are one with Christ and Christ with them; they are made members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones:' and by partaking of the Spirit of him their head, receive all the graces and benefits purchased for them by his bitter death, and passion.

"Wherefore it is evident that since the body *broken* and the blood *shed* neither do nor can now really exist, they neither can be really present, nor literally eaten or drank, nor can we really receive *them*, but only the benefits purchased by them. But the body which now exists whereof we partake, and to which we are united, is the glorified body: which is therefore verily and indeed received (as we shall see anon), and by consequence said to be really present notwithstanding its local absence; because a real participation and union must needs imply a real presence, though they do not necessarily require a local one. For it is easy to conceive how a thing that is locally absent may yet be really received, as he that *receives a disciple* is said to *receive Christ;* as the disciples themselves *received the Holy Ghost;* as the king in the Gospel *received a kingdom;* or as we commonly say a man *receives an estate or inheritance* when he receives the deeds or conveyances of it. In all which cases the reception is confessedly real, though the thing itself is not locally or circumscriptively present, or literally grasped in the arms of the receiver.

"This by the way may serve to show the vanity as well as falsehood of Transubstantiation, which was first devised to solve the literal eating of the glorified body of our Saviour: whereas though the body that *is* glorified be numerically the same that *was* broken, yet the body which *is eaten as dead*, and the body which is *present as glorified*, are two as different things as can well be imagined.

"This may likewise serve to show, that there is no great disagreement among those Protestants whom the Papists too hastily charge with it. For they all agree that we spiritually eat Christ's Body and drink his Blood: that we neither eat nor drink nor receive the *dead body* nor the *blood shed*, but only the *benefits* pur-

chased by them: that these benefits are derived to us by virtue of our union and communion with the glorified body: and that our partaking of it, and union with it, is effected by the mysterious and ineffable operation of the Holy Spirit. The only difference is, that one part, from the premises, infer, that Christ may be truly said to be *really present* in the Eucharist; whereas the other scruple at the use of *that expression* (because the local absence of his body is confessed on both sides), notwithstanding they agree in all the points which the other party think requisite to defend it.

"Now though it be easy, as I said before, to conceive how a natural substance may be said to be *really received* though not *locally present;* it is not so easy to conceive it *really present* when at the same time it is *locally absent.* Therefore the Church of England has wisely forborne to use the term of *Real Presence* in all the Books that are set forth by her authority. We neither find it recommended in the Liturgy, nor the Articles, nor the Homilies, nor the Church's nor Nowell's Catechism. For although it be once in the Liturgy, and once more in the Articles [he means in the Liturgy and Articles of 1552], it is mentioned in both places as a phrase of the Papists, and rejected for their abuse of it. *So that if any Church of England man use it, he does more than the Church directs him; if any reject it, he has the Church's example to warrant him: and it would very much contribute to the peace of Christendom if all men would write after so good a copy.*

"Yet it must not be denied but the term may be safely used amongst scholars; and seems to be grounded upon the language of Scripture itself. For when our Saviour promises 'to be in the midst of them that call upon him;' and 'to be with his Church always to the end of the world,' no doubt he promises to be 'really present' with them, though he does not mean that his natural body shall be *locally present* amongst them. So St. Paul speaks of his own being 'absent in body but present in spirit.' 1 Cor. v. 3. The Romans used to call their gods *præsentes Deos*, not as *locally present*, but always *ready to assist* them: and whatever is in readiness when we want it, to answer our occasions, may be properly said παρεῖναι, *to be at hand, to be present.* A man does truly *repræsentare pecuniam* when he gives a good bill for it, though he does not pay it down *in specie.* The Holy Ghost is said to 'abide and dwell in us;' which words imply a *continual presence;* no doubt *real*, though not *physical* and *local*, but only by his grace and influence. In short, whatever we enjoy, use, and reap the benefit of, as truly as if it were *præ sensibus*, is as *really* present as if it were *physically* so: nay, no doubt when virtue went out of our Saviour's body to heal the woman in the Gospel, though the Jews thronged him, and she did but touch his

garment, yet his body was *more really* present to her whom the virtue of it healed than to them whom the substance of it touched.

" So much for the use of the word: which when we of the Church of England use, we mean thus. A thing may be said to be *really received*, which is so consigned to us, that we can readily employ it to all those purposes for which it is useful in itself, and we have occasion to use it: and a thing thus *really received* may be said to be *really present* two ways, viz. either *physically* or *morally*, to which we reduce *sacramentally*. A *physical* presence (now we speak of a natural body) is *local; antecedent* to the reception and *independent* upon it: the thing is first *really present* and then *really received;* and though it were not *received*, would be still *really present*. A *moral presence* is only *virtual, consequent* to the reception and *dependent* upon it: the thing is first *really received*, and by consequence said to be *really present;* but it is not at all *present* to them that do not *really receive it*. Thus in the Holy Eucharist, the *sacrament* is *physically*, the *res sacramenti morally* present: the *elements antecedently* and *locally*, the *very body consequentially* and *virtually*, but both *really present*.

" From hence it is evident, that if we rightly understand the presence, it is not material with what adverbs we affirm it. We may say, it is *really, essentially*, nay *corporally* present: that is, it is *present* in as much as it is *really received* to all intents and purposes for which the *res ipsa*, the *essence*, the *substance*, the *very body* would be useful to us, if it were *physically* and *locally* present. And the difference between us and the Papists is plain. They (however they express themselves) understand a *local* presence, which we deny, and therefore reject their expression. We (whatever term we use) mean only a *spiritual and virtual* presence, and explain the term we make use of to that effect. Thus the Protestants in King Henry VIII's time, that suffered upon the six Articles, denied the *Real Presence* (i. e. the Popish sense of it), but meant the same thing with us, who think we may lawfully use that term. On the other side that excellent person and glorious martyr, Mr. Bradford, (Acts and Monum. p. 1608.) 'I do believe' (says he) 'that Christ is *corporally* present, at and in the due administration of the Sacrament.' But he adds this explication, 'By this word *corporally* I mean that Christ is present corporally *unto faith*.'

" It is likewise evident, that when we say Christ is *present*, or *adorable in the Sacrament*, WE DO NOT MEAN IN THE ELEMENTS, BUT IN THE CELEBRATION. We affirm his natural body to be *locally* in heaven and not here; and that we, who are here and not in heaven, ought to worship it as *locally present in heaven*, while we celebrate the Holy Sacrament upon earth.

"Lastly it is evident, that this doctrine is sufficiently removed from what the pamphlet calls Zuinglianism, how truly I will not now inquire. For we do not hold that we barely receive the *effects* and *benefits* of Christ's Body; but we hold it *really present*, in as much as it is *really received*, and we actually put in possession of it though *locally absent* from us. So that while we *spiritually* eat Christ's flesh and drink his blood, we through faith, in a mysterious and ineffable manner, dwell in Christ and Christ in us; we are one with Christ and Christ with us; and by virtue of this *spiritual* and *mystical* yet *real participation*, we receive the *benefits consequent* to it; even the remission of our sins and all other benefits of Christ's Passion.

"This, in short, is our meaning; *and to this effect all true Church of England men declare it.* Whether we express ourselves in proper and accurate terms is another question, wherein if the Editor think fit to engage, we are ready to answer him. In the meantime we desire him and the rest of his Communion, not to catch up our words, and bait them in their own sense, which is too like the dealing of the *Old Romans* with the *Primitive Christians*."[1]

Such are the words of an able divine of our Church far enough removed from what are called Low-Church or Calvinistic propensities, for he was one of the High Church divines that united with Dr. Jane and others in the time of William and Mary, in resisting all concessions to dissenters. The Archdeacons may call his doctrine Zuinglianism or anything else, but that will prove nothing, and certainly not alter the fact that it is a formal statement of the doctrine of our Church by an eminent High Church divine. And they will do well to heed the admonition given at the close of his statement, when they cite all maintainers of *a* doctrine of the Real Presence as defenders of *their* doctrine on the subject.

*Secondly*, All these three writers have made a most remarkable blunder in adducing a pretended quotation from the first book of Homilies in their favour. In an *Advertisement* which was appended to the first book of Homilies, printed in 1547, before the doctrine of Transubstantiation had been renounced by the English Church, appeared the following words:— "Hereafter shall follow sermons of fasting .... *of the due receiving of His Blessed Body and Blood, under the form of*

[1] A Reply to two Discourses, &c. Oxf. 1687, 4to. pp. 13—18.

*bread and wine*, against Idleness," &c. And this *Advertisement*, though of course *forming no part of the Homilies*, was repeated by succeeding printers in their editions of the Book, even *after the second Book had been added, in which a Homily had been given on the subject, maintaining a totally different doctrine from that implied in these words*. Upon these words the writers whom we are opposing have laid their hands, and eagerly paraded them as a genuine extract from our authorized Formularies, speaking of them as if they were contained *in the Homilies*.

The statements of Archdeacon Denison to this effect I have already quoted. And I regret to find that Dr. Pusey[1] and Archdeacon Wilberforce[2] have both made the same misstatement, quoting these words as occurring in the Homilies, and so as representing the doctrine of our Church, while it really is difficult to suppose that either one or the other could be ignorant of their true meaning, and that they were in fact intended to express the doctrine of Transubstantiation, and moreover formed no part of the Homilies. It is deeply painful to have to call public attention to such facts connected with persons who, by their position, ought to be far above all such conduct.

Dr. Pusey hesitates not to call them *the words of the Church of England*,[3] and the "statement" "*of our Homilies!*"[4] And actually grounds upon them the assertion, that "the Church of England believes that 'under the form of Bread and Wine,' so consecrated, we 'receive the Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ.'"[5]

Now even if he had not known the meaning of these words, his own references would have amply shown him what it was. For thus he speaks in one place:

"The strongest statement of the earliest Confession of Augsburg—'Of the Supper of the Lord, it is taught that the very Body and Blood of Christ are verily present in the Lord's Supper, under the form of bread and wine, and are distributed and taken in it'—like

[1] Pusey's Presence of Christ in the Eucharist, a Sermon before the University, &c., 1853, pp. 14, 16, 22.

[2] Wilberforce's Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist, 1853, 8vo. p. 165, 130 *note*, and see p. 180.

[3] Pusey's Presence of Christ in the Eucharist, p. 14. [4] Ib. p. 16. [5] Ib. p. 22.

that of our homilies, [!] offers no physical explanation, but simply expresses the real unseen sacramental Presence under the outward visible form. To receive literally, then, those words of our Lord, 'This is my Body,' does not necessarily imply any absence, or cessation, or annihilation of the substance of the outward elements."[1]

Thus Dr. Pusey would fain have us suppose that the words he has quoted from what he calls "the earliest Confession of Augsburg" are consistent with his notion of a Presence in or under the bread and wine without "any absence, or cessation, or annihilation of the substance of the outward elements," when it is almost inconceivable he could be ignorant what the words "form of bread and wine" meant, namely, their visible *shape* when the substance was gone. He himself refers to the German edition of the Confession, and to Hospinian, Hist. Sacram. Pt. ii. pp. 155, sqq. Now the word in the German edition, translated "form," is *gestalt*, which means *shape*, or outward appearance. And the comment of Hospinian, to which Dr. Pusey himself refers, is this.—After stating that the Tenth Article of the Augsburg Confession stood thus in the first edition, published at Wittemberg in German, he remarks:—"These words indicate that "*not the substance but only the form* of bread and wine is pre-"sent, and covers the Body of Christ, lying hidden under each "form through the concomitance of the flesh and blood. More-"over *these words are accepted by the Papists, as agreeing with* "*their own view*, as the Confutation [2] of the Confession by the "Papists shows." And he says that Lindanus, whom the rest of the Jesuits follow, asserts that, at first, "the doctrine and *the* "*very words* of the Confession of Augsburg were the same with "the doctrine and words of the Papists concerning the change "of the mystical bread into the Body of the Lord." And he adds that some of the Protestant party objected to these words, Philip, the Landgrave of Hesse, publicly opposing them in the Council, and that consequently in the first authorized edition of the Confession, which appeared in 1531 in Latin, these words were altered, and great complaints were made of the German edition of 1530, as having been surreptitiously put

[1] Ib. p. 16.

[2] That Confutation expressly says,—"Decimus Articulus in verbis nihil offendit." Libr. Symbol. ed. Pfaff. Tubing. 1730. Append. p. 13.

forth, *ab avaro aliquo typographo*, without authority. That which appears in the German edition was evidently, from the historical accounts given of the matter, a sketch drawn up by some more timid hands, under the fear of the strongly expressed views of the Emperor on the subject; but the Article in question appeared in the first authorized edition of 1531 as follows:— "De Cœna Domini docent, quod corpus et sanguis Christi vere "adsint: et cum pane et vino distribuantur vescentibus in Cœna "Domini: et improbant secus docentes."[1]

What therefore was meant by the words "under the form of bread and wine" is clear. In fact, the words our authors have quoted from the *Advertisement* in the first edition of the Book of Homilies are, as it is almost superfluous to inform any one moderately read in the Romish controversy, directly expressive of the doctrine of Transubstantiation, and were the regular phrase used at that time by the Romanists for expressing that doctrine, as any reader may see in the controversial works of the period.

The Papists, says Cranmer, writing against Gardiner in 1551, "say, that the very natural flesh and blood of Christ, "which suffered for us upon the cross, and sitteth at the right "hand of the Father in heaven, is also really, substantially, "corporally and naturally, in or under *the accidents of the Sa-* "*cramental bread and wine*, WHICH THEY CALL THE FORMS OF "BREAD AND WINE."[2] And Gardiner says,—"The true faith "of the Church . . . . doth not teach that Christ is in the bread "and wine, which was the doctrine of Luther; but the true "faith is, that Christ's most precious body and blood is, by the "might of his word and determination of his will, which he "declareth by his word, in his holy supper present *under form* "*of bread and wine*."[3]

So that the phrase was peculiar to those who held the doctrine of transubstantiation, and maintained that the *forms* or appearances only of bread and wine remained in the consecrated elements.

Now this doctrine Archdeacon Denison expressly repudiates. He declares that the bread and wine *do* remain, and that Christ's

[1] Hospinian. loc. cit. p. 157.
[2] Answ. to Gardiner, Park. Soc. ed. p. 46.
[3] Ib. p. 51.

Body and Blood are present in them. So that in his want of knowledge of the meaning of the phrase, he is actually pressing into his service a Popish phrase opposed to the doctrine he himself upholds.

And as to the Church of England being responsible for this phrase, although what has been said is sufficient to refute the notion, it may be well to quote a few words from Cranmer in the context of the passage just cited. He says in reply to Gardiner,—

"Ye find fault that I have untruly reported the papistical faith, (which you call the faith of the Church) which teacheth not, say you, that Christ is in the bread and wine, but *under the forms of bread and wine.* But to answer you, I say, that the papists do teach that Christ is in the visible signs, and whether they list to call them bread and wine, or the forms of bread and wine, all is one to me; for the truth is, that he is neither corporally in the bread and wine, nor in or under the forms and figures of them, but is corporally in heaven, and spiritually in his lively members, which be his temples where he inhabiteth."[1]

I shall not here press this passage as opposed to the Archdeacon's own notions, because I shall adduce still plainer testimonies from Cranmer on that point, but as a proof that the phrase in question is no Church-of-England phrase it is decisive.

And, again, in reply to an assertion of Gardiner that in the English Communion book of 1549 it was said, "the Body and Blood of Christ to be under the form of bread and wine," Cranmer says,—"As concerning the form of doctrine used in "this Church of England in the holy communion, that the Body "and Blood of Christ be *under the forms of bread and wine,* "when you shall show the place where this form of words is "expressed, then shall you purge yourself of that which in the "meantime I take to be *a plain untruth.*"[2] Probably Gardiner was thinking of the very Advertisement at the end of the Book of Homilies now under consideration. But Cranmer's words show that he repudiated the phrase altogether as one used by the Church of England.

I will add a few more passages establishing the use of the phrase as peculiar to the Romanists, and expressive of their doctrine of transubstantiation.

[1] Ans. to Gardiner; Park. Soc. ed. pp. 52, 53. [2] Ib. 53.

"How agreeth this with *the common saying of all the papists*, that Christ is contained *under the forms of bread and wine*,"[1] &c.? "When the papists teach that the body of Christ is really in the sacrament *under the form of bread*, they speak not,"[2] &c. "How plainly St. Ambrose speaketh against *the papists*, which say that the body and blood of Christ remain *sub speciebus panis et vini, under the forms of bread and wine*.'"[3] "To the faithful is seen present the most precious body and blood of our Saviour Christ *under the forms of bread and wine*."[4]

Other illustrations of the meaning of the phrase may be obtained from the controversy between Jewel and Harding.

Thus Harding says,—"Neither can it be said that the bread "and wine which were before are the sacraments, for that the "bread is become the body, and the wine the blood, and so now "they are not; and if they be not, then neither be they sacra- "ments. Therefore, that *the outward forms of bread and wine* "*which remain* be the sacraments of Christ's Body and Blood, "and not the very bread and wine itself, it followeth by sequel "of reason," &c. Upon which Jewel remarks,—"M. Harding "presumeth that his new fantasy of transubstantiation must "needs stand for good. And therefore, imagining that the "bread and wine are wholly removed, and cannot be the sacra- "ments, he thinketh he may well conclude that *the forms and* "*shows that are left behind* must needs be the sacraments."[5]

Again, Harding says,—"That the outward form of bread, "which is properly the sacrament, is the sign of the Body of "Christ, we confess, yea of that Body which is covertly in or "under the same."[6]

And in his Confutation of Jewel's Apology, he says,—"The "form of bread and wine, which is seen, is the sacrament, that "is to say, a sign of the holy thing: for a sacrament, besides "the outward shape which it representeth to the senses, causeth "another thing to come into knowledge. . . . . here are three "distinct things understanded. . . . The first is *the visible shape* "*or form of bread and wine*," &c.[7]

[1] Cranmer against Gardiner, ib. p. 59. [2] Id. ib. p. 60. [3] Id. ib. p. 323.
[4] Gardiner against Cranmer, ib. p. 344.
[5] Jewel against Harding. Art. 25. Wks. P. S. ed. vol. ii p. 791.
[6] Ib Art. 26, p. 796.
[7] Jewel's Def. of Apol. Pt. 2, ch. 12. div. 1. Wks. vol. 3. p. 466.

It almost needs an apology to any reader well-informed on the subject to delay him with these proofs of the meaning which the phrase in question bore at the time it was used in the Advertisement to the first edition of the Book of Homilies. But unfortunately there are too many among us to whom such information seems necessary.

The phrase therefore expresses the doctrine of Transubstantiation; and it is evident from Cranmer's answer to Gardiner just quoted, that he knew of no place in which the Reformed Church of England was committed to the phrase; and therefore certainly did not recognise the authority of this Advertisement; and the sanction given to the Homilies in the Articles cannot be extended beyond the Homilies themselves.

Nor is it difficult to account for its occurrence in the first edition of the Book of Homilies, as we know, from Cranmer's own testimony, that he had not then embraced the true doctrine on the subject of the Eucharist. That he held the doctrine of the Bodily Presence till after this time, he himself tells us. For in his Answer to Dr. Smith appended to his Answer to Bishop Gardiner on this subject, first published in 1551, he says, speaking of the Catechism he published in 1548;—"But this I confess of myself, "that *not long before I wrote the said Catechism, I was in that error* "*of the real* [meaning *bodily*] *presence*, as I was many years past "in divers other errors, as of transubstantiation, of the sacrifice "propitiatory of the priests in the mass," &c.[1] And Traheron writing to Bullinger on Sept. 28, 1548, (more than a year after the publication of the Book of Homilies) says,—"That you "may add yet more to the praises of God, you must know that "Latimer has come over to our opinion respecting the true "doctrine of the Eucharist, together with the Archbishop of "Canterbury and the other bishops, who heretofore seemed to "be Lutherans."[2] And again on Dec. 31 of the same year he writes to the same,—"On the 14th of December, if I mistake "not, a disputation was held at London concerning the eucharist. "....The Archbishop of Canterbury, *contrary to general ex-* "*pectation*, most openly, firmly, and learnedly maintained your

[1] Works P. S. ed. Pt. i. p. 374.

[2] Original Letters relative to the Engl. Reform. published by Parker Society, Camb. 1846, vol. i. p. 322.

"opinion upon this subject.... I perceive that it is all over "with Lutheranism, now that those who were considered its "principal and almost only supporters, have altogether come "over to our side."[1] So John ab Ulmis writing to Bullinger from Oxford, Nov. 27, 1548, speaks of Cranmer as then "in a great measure recovered from his dangerous lethargy" on the subject of the presence in the Supper,[2] though he had spoken in different language of him so recently as the previous August; and on March 2, 1549, speaking of the Conference on the Eucharist above alluded to, he, like Traheron, remarks, that the Archbishop of Canterbury had, "*contrary to general expectation,*" spoken on the subject correctly and clearly.[3] So that he held the notion of a *real bodily presence* more than a year after the publication of the Homilies. And as he did not long hold the Lutheran view of the Eucharist, we may reasonably conclude that at the date of the first edition of the Book of Homilies, he had not given up the old phraseology of his Church on the subject.

Nay more, the "Order of the Communion" issued by public authority about the same time as the Homilies, and in use for some time after their publication, being enforced by the subsequent "Injunctions" of 1547 and the "Articles of Visitation" of 1548, *requires the Mass to be still said according to the old form*, contenting itself with the sole change of giving the cup to the laity, and adding some appropriate addresses and prayers.

And even when the Prayer Book of 1549 was being prepared, so far was the doctrine of Transubstantiation from having been publicly rejected, that we are told that in the discussions that took place respecting it, "the bishops could not of a long time agree among themselves respecting the Article of the Lord's Supper, and it was *a long and earnest dispute among them whether transubstantiation should be established or rejected.*"[4]

Let us now proceed, then, to consider the character of the three propositions which I have shown above to be maintained by Archdeacon Denison and Dr. Pusey, and which are also

[1] Ib. p. 323. [2] Ib. p. 383. [3] Ib. p. 388.
[4] Dryander's Lett. to Bullinger dated June 5, 1549. Original Letters relative to Engl. Reform.; Park. Soc. ed. vol. i. p. 351.

held by Archdeacon Wilberforce, except as to there being no change in the substance of the bread and wine. All three agree that the Body and Blood of Christ are eaten by *the mouth* of the communicant, and under the form of bread and wine, and are so eaten by *all* the communicants, faithful and faithless.

Now as it respects the second of these three assertions, namely, that the Body and Blood of Christ are eaten "under the form of bread and wine," which is founded upon the words of the Advertisement in the first Book of Homilies, the remarks just made will suffice to show, that the statement is not one for which the authority of the Church of England can be pleaded, but is expressive of the Popish doctrine of transubstantiation. No further notice therefore need be taken of an assertion which we must charitably hope is founded upon ignorance of the meaning of the phrase.

The first and third therefore are those with which we have to deal. Now I readily admit, that if the first proposition is true, the third follows from it. If by consecration such an effect is produced upon the bread and wine, as is contemplated in the first proposition, then it seems to follow, that the wicked eat and drink the body and blood of Christ equally with the faithful. But it is also undeniable, that wherever it is maintained, that the unbelieving do *not* eat and drink the body and blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper, then it must be maintained, in common consistency, that such a change in the bread and wine does *not* take place; and consequently if we find that the Church of England expressly maintains, that the wicked do not eat the body and blood of Christ in the Eucharist, that fact alone will not only overthrow the third proposition, but also affords *of itself* strong presumptive evidence that she does not hold any such effect to be produced upon the bread and wine by consecration, as is supposed in the first; and beyond this presumptive evidence we shall find an abundance of proof of a direct kind.

It is well to observe also before we pass on, that if the consecrated Bread and Wine so become the Body and Blood of Christ that by oral manducation of them we necessarily become recipients of that Body and Blood, then not merely the wicked, but even brute animals partaking of the Bread and Wine

become recipients of Christ's Body and Blood. And all that Archdeacon Denison can say in reply to this difficulty is this,—

"We are told in holy Scripture, as witnessed to by the Church Catholic, what the consecrated elements are to man's nature in body and in soul; but we are not told anything about what they are to the brute creation. We are therefore, as it appears to me, altogether precluded even from speculating upon what may happen to the consecrated elements in connection with any act of the brute creation; much more from drawing analogies from it, or building arguments thereupon."[1]

But that which they are in themselves to one, the same are they to another. And therefore the consistent Romanists maintain, that brute animals eating and drinking the consecrated Bread and Wine, eat and drink the Body and Blood of Christ.

It will be observed, that the doctrine of the writers under review is founded upon the supposition that our Lord's Body has two different modes of existence, one natural, the other supernatural; one material, the other spiritual: and that while it is locally, materially, and after the natural manner of existence in heaven, it can be at the same time present immaterially and as a spirit, after a supernatural mode of existence, in all parts of the world. And this, we may observe, is precisely the doctrine of the Romanists.[2] This privilege has by some writers been ascribed to our Lord's present *glorified state* subsequent to his resurrection, but Archdeacon Wilberforce is inclined to attribute it rather to the union of the human with the Divine nature,[3] which enables him to get over a difficulty obviously attaching itself to the other view, namely, that such a supposition does not account for the distribution of our Lord's Body to his disciples at the Last Supper, *previous* to his resurrection.

And the supposed presence in the Eucharist is only a presence of his body after a spiritual and supernatural manner, that is, a state of existence after the manner of a spirit. The real Body and Blood of Christ are present in the consecrated Bread and Wine, but only spiritually and not materially. So that the flesh and blood of Christ are present in the Bread and Wine, but yet there is no flesh and no blood present; these material things

[1] Sermon ii. Note, p. 138.

[2] See Concil. Trident. Sess. 13, c. 1.

[3] Doctr. of Euch. pp. 154, 155.

are present, but there is no matter present; the body is present, but there is no presence of a body, and the blood is present, but there is no presence of blood.

Now from this it would follow that our Lord has two bodies, one of a material kind, and another of an immaterial; a notion not only groundless, but contrary to all that is delivered to us on the subject. That our Lord's glorified body differs in some respects from that which he bore on earth, is no doubt true. And what the precise nature of that difference may be, is not revealed to us. But what it is in one place, that it is in another. And as to its being present only after the manner of a spirit, I ask with Bishop Jeremy Taylor, "Can a body remaining a body be at the same time a spirit?"[1]

The very foundation of the doctrine of these authors—namely, that through the union of the Divine with the human nature in the person of Christ, the Body and Blood of Christ, especially since their resurrection from the grave and ascension into heaven, can be present after a supernatural manner in every place—is what is expressly denied by Hooker. He says,—"Neither "are the properties of man's nature in the person of Christ by "force and virtue of the same conjunction so much altered, as "not to stay within those limits which our substance is bor-"dered withal."[2] And again further on, in the same place, more distinctly, he says,—"Shall we say, that in heaven his "glorious body, by virtue of the same cause, hath now power to "present itself in all places, and to be everywhere at once "present?" and he answers this question in the negative, observing that notwithstanding the peculiar virtue and power with which it is endowed, "a body still it continueth, a body "consubstantial with our bodies, a body of the same both "nature and measure which it had on earth;" and he supports it by the testimony of Theodoret. And he frequently repeats this in the subsequent context.[3]

And the only limitation he admits to this truth is, that by the conjunction of his human nature with that Divine nature which is everywhere present, his body has "*a presence of force and efficacy* throughout all generations of men."[4]

[1] Real Presence, Sect. xi. § 14, p. 213. ed. 1654.
[2] Eccl. Pol. v. 54.
[3] Ib. § 55.
[4] Ib. v. 55. 9.

A body such as that which our Lord assumed must have a local presence, and can only be in one place. "I appeal," says Bishop Taylor again, "to any man of the Roman "persuasion, if they can show me any antient philosopher, "Greek or Roman or Christian of any nation, who did not "believe it to be essential to the being of a body to be in one "place . . . and therefore, to make the body of Christ to be in "a thousand places at once, and yet to be but one body, to be "in heaven and to be upon so many altars . . . is to make a "body to be a spirit, and to make a finite to be infinite; for "nothing can be so but an infinite Spirit."[1] And therefore he ridicules the notion of Christ's body being in the sacrament, and yet not there *locally*, as nonsense, saying, "I wish the words "were sense, and that I could tell the meaning of being in a "place locally and not locally, unless a thing can be in a place "and not in a place, that is, so to be *in*, that it is also *out*."[2] And therefore, while he strenuously advocates the doctrine of the Real Presence, he as strenuously insists upon its true meaning being that Christ's body is present in the Sacrament "really *in effect and blessing*."[3] "Christ is present spiritually, that is, by effect and blessing."[4]

And such passages as these in our great divines of the former part of the 17th century, will fully account for the change of the words "real and essential" into "corporal" on the restoration of the Rubric in 1662; for the true doctrine of the Real Presence was maintained, while the presence of the body, that is, the corporal presence, after a spiritual manner, was denied and ridiculed.

But this point will come more fully under consideration hereafter.

Still further; even if we granted such a presence, it might be supposed that an *oral* reception of the Body and Blood of Christ *so present, by which* ALONE *the faithless can receive them*, would hardly be contended for. For how can we eat and drink a spirit? If the Body and Blood of Christ are present in a manner not sensible to the sight or touch, how can we receive them into our mouths?

As it is well said by an eminent prelate of our Church in

[1] Real Presence, Sect. xi. § 14, pp. 212, 213.
[2] Ib. p. 223.
[3] Ib. p. 218.
[4] Ib. p. 5.

former times, whose name, like that of others, has been often cited in favour of very different views, Bishop Bilson,—

"That which entereth the body must be local and corporal. That which feedeth the soul must be spiritual and intellectual. The soul hath no local receipts, nor corporal instruments for her kind of eating, but only faith and understanding. So that if the flesh of Christ in this mystery be material and local, how can it feed the soul? If it be spiritual and intellectual, how can it be chammed with teeth, or closed in the straits of the stomach? *Local not local, corporal not corporal*, be plain contradictions, and by no means incident to the natural flesh of Christ. One it must needs be, both it cannot be; though you would sweat out your hearts with wrangling."[1]

Nor can it be said that Scripture compels us to believe that such is the case, because it clearly is open to us to give a figurative sense to the expressions of Scripture, if the literal sense involves a palpable absurdity or self-contradiction. And Bellarmine himself admits, that Scripture alone would not oblige us to receive the doctrine of the corporal presence, as its expressions might, without violence, be interpreted in another sense.

Further; it is admitted by Archdeacon Wilberforce himself, that the Body and Blood of Christ are food only for the soul, not for the body.[2] Though he contends that they are received by the body, he confesses that no result arises from that reception in itself. It follows therefore that, according to his own doctrine, the communion that takes place between the soul and Christ can only be by such acts as the soul is capable of.

And as to such a presence of that Body and Blood in the Bread and Wine as would cause them to be swallowed by the mouth, even if it were vouchsafed, it would not in the least help forward the desired object, that is, the soul's feeding on Christ's Body and Blood.

The Body of Christ is as well calculated to be food for faith or the soul to feed upon while at the right hand of God in heaven, as it would be if lying in the mouth or the stomach, and is as much *present* to faith in the one case as in the other. A thing may be present to the spirit, and be the subject of spiritual acts, which is not received into the body.

[1] Difference between Christian Subjection, &c., pp. 776, 7. ed. 1585. 4to.
[2] pp. 405—414.

The Archdeacon, therefore, appears to me to have involved himself here in an inconsistency. His admission that the Body and Blood of Christ are food only for the soul, and can only be fed upon by faith, makes his doctrine of their *oral* reception absurd. For they who maintain this doctrine ought certainly to maintain that some purpose is answered by such a reception, whereas the view he has connected with it makes it wholly devoid of end or purpose. But he has been led into this inconsistency by his desire to make it appear that his doctrine is not opposed to certain statements of the Fathers.

Moreover, if it be admitted, that the Body and Blood of Christ are the food of the soul, not of the body, then it is clear that when we speak of *eating and drinking the real body and blood of Christ*, the words must be interpreted in a sense suitable to spiritual acts, or the acts of the soul, that is, in a figurative sense. And in such a sense we find no difficulty in understanding how the *real material* body and blood of Christ, though in heaven, can be eaten and drunk by us on earth. And this was what our Lord spoke of in his Last Supper. For the Body and Blood there spoken of are the Body that was broken and the Blood that was shed upon the cross. And of *these* we can *spiritually* eat and drink. But this *spiritual eating* our authors have turned into *eating a spirit*, that is, eating Christ's Body present after the manner of a spirit; which is a vastly different notion, and teeming with absurdities.

And hence we find Cranmer, in a passage cited above, maintaining that it is Christ's "true, natural, and *organical* flesh" that is "given to us to be eaten." And consequently when our Church denied the corporal presence, the presence of the real body and blood, it indirectly maintained, in so doing, the figurative sense of the words *eating* and *drinking*, because it *is* of *the true real material Body and Blood* of Christ that we are to eat and drink.

But that a material body and material blood should be present only immaterially and spiritually, and that we should eat and drink with our bodily organs matter that is not material and substance that is not substantial, flesh that is not carnal and blood that is not bloody, is an assertion unworthy of any rational person.

There is a vast difference between saying that we eat spiritually a material thing, and that we eat with our mouths that which exists only in an immaterial and spiritual form. The latter is simple nonsense, involving a self-contradiction in terms. The former is perfectly intelligible, involving only one of the most common figures of speech.

The real material Body and Blood of Christ may be made present to the *spirit* of man, as the sun is present when seen and felt, and be spiritually fed upon by the soul through faith. And as to any Marcionite phantasm of the Body and Blood of Christ, such as our authors imagine, this is not what the believer wants. His faith wants the reality to feed upon; the true material body and blood; the body that was broken and the blood that was shed upon the cross.

But all these points I shall discuss more fully hereafter.

There is one more consideration to which, before I conclude this chapter, I would briefly direct the attention of the reader, and that is, that the erroneous view we have been contemplating of the nature of our Lord's presence in the Eucharist is not a mere theoretical error, but one which leads to many practical errors and abuses.

It leads directly to the undue exaltation of the ministerial office. It supposes a power to be vested in the ministers of Christ of making bread and wine, whenever they please, the Body and Blood of Christ. Of the spirit engendered by such a notion we may see an apt illustration in Archdeacon Denison's Sermons.[1] And we may see hence that it matters little whether the doctrine embraced is that of Transubstantiation or Consubstantiation. If the elements are held to be so made by consecration the Body and Blood of Christ that that Body and Blood are received into the mouths of all the communicants, it matters little comparatively what explanations may be given as to the precise way in which they become so.

And among other evils to which such doctrine as that we have been considering leads, must be classed *the adoration of the consecrated elements;* for whether it be the doctrine of Consubstantiation or Transubstantiation that is maintained, such

[1] See extracts, p. 16 above.

adoration is held to be due;[1] in one case it is paid to a supposed presence of Christ in or under the bread and wine, and in the other to a supposed presence of Christ substituted for the substance of the bread and wine. And the distinction between the two appears to me to be of very little importance, nor can I understand how one who kneels down before the consecrated elements for the purpose of worshipping a supposed presence of Christ in them, can have much right to censure one who kneels down before them for the purpose of worshipping them as being the Body and Blood of Christ.

More especially has this doctrine of the Real Substantial Presence led the Romanists to all the corruptions of the sacrifice of the Mass and its consequent evils, by which the sacrifice of our Blessed Lord upon the cross is made to give place to the sacrifice of the priest in the Mass, and the people are taught to look to their priests as their mediators, turning bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ, and offering them up to God to obtain his pardon for their sins.

And to all these consequences we find Archdeacon Wilberforce already committed.

The interests of truth in our Church, therefore, imperatively require, that such teaching as that inculcated by the authors above referred to should be restrained. And I would again remind the reader, before I pass on, what is the great point I am seeking to establish in this work in opposition to their views. It is, in few words, that the presence of Christ in the Eucharist is vouchsafed, not in or to the bread and wine, but only to the faithful communicant, and that the reception of the Body and Blood of Christ is not an oral reception, necessarily consequent upon the reception of the consecrated elements both in the case of the faithful and the faithless, but a spiritual reception, consequent upon an act of faith. They are given by God, and taken and received by the hand of faith.

[1] See Denison's 2nd Sermon, p. 81, and Wilberforce as quoted above. So the Lutherans "teach, that the Body and Blood of Christ in the Sacrament may very lawfully and piously be adored; but that the bread is not to be adored." (Mentzer's Vindication of the Lutheran Religion from the Charge of Popery, translated. Lond. 1720, 8vo. p. 168.)

## CHAPTER III.

### EXAMINATION OF THE SCRIPTURAL ARGUMENT ON THE SUBJECT.

In proceeding to consider the testimony of Holy Scripture on the subject of this work, I must premise that so far as concerns the question of the orthodoxy of those whose opinions I am controverting *as ministers of the Church of England*, it cannot be determined by any private interpretation of Holy Scripture, still less of the writings of the antient Fathers. Our Church points us indeed to Holy Scripture as the *ultimate authority* on which the faith of *all* should rest for the truth of any doctrine. But they who profess in adult age to belong to any Church, and certainly all who are ministering in it and enjoying its advantages on the faith of a solemn pledge that they hold its doctrines, are bound, so long as they choose to retain their position in it, by the interpretation of Holy Scripture given in its authorized Formularies. When therefore the question is, whether a man is holding or teaching doctrine consistent with his position as a professed member or minister of the Church of England, the enquiry must be determined, not by an appeal to Holy Scripture interpreted by the private judgment of individuals, still less (as the Tractarians are in the habit of doing, especially in this controversy) by an appeal to the Fathers, but by an appeal to the authoritative Formularies of our Church. And when the Tractarians, after having roamed far and wide in the wilderness of Patristical writings, bring us back the results of their researches, and then tell us, as Dr. Pusey and others are so fond of doing, that the doctrine *they* have gathered from the Fathers *must* be the doctrine of the Church of England, because the Church of

England professes to be in all important points in agreement with the Catholic Fathers, they must be reckoning largely on the credulity of their readers.

But I think it may be on many accounts desirable to meet the argument which Archdeacons Denison and Wilberforce and Dr. Pusey have raised from Scripture in favour of their views, and therefore I shall devote this chapter to the consideration of it.

"The fact of the Real Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the consecrated Bread and Wine rests," Archdeacon Denison tells us, on the following passages of Holy Scripture:—Matt. xxvi. 26—29; Mark xiv. 22—25; Luke xxii. 14—21; John vi. 50—58, and perhaps the whole chapter from verse 4 to verse 71, inclusive; 1 Cor. x. 16—21; xi. 23, 24.[1] And for a proof against all attempts "to assign a figurative character to the words of institution," he refers to Dr. Pusey's Sermon (pp. 25—33), and adds that he "subscribes fully and "unreservedly to that part also of the argument of the Sermon "(pp. 33 et seq.) which shews with equal conclusiveness that "the same principle of *literal* interpretation, which is affirmed "to be the only true principle of interpretation of the words of "institution, is to be extended to the words employed by the "Evangelists and St. Paul to designate the elements *after con-*"*secration*. We may not interpret 'This is my Body' *literally*, "and 'this fruit of the vine,' 'this bread,' 'the bread which we "break,' *figuratively*."[2]

The doctrine, therefore, which we are to elicit from Holy Scripture (according to Archdeacon Denison and Dr. Pusey) is this,—that after the elements are consecrated, that which appears to us to be bread, is bread and the Body of Christ present in a supernatural and spiritual way together, and that which appears to us to be wine, is wine and the Blood of Christ present in a supernatural and spiritual way together; which is, in fact, the Lutheran doctrine.

Archdeacon Wilberforce refers to the same passages of Holy Scripture,[3] but carries his view much nearer to that of the Church of Rome. He does not admit that the bread remains thus unchanged, and has only the Body of Christ added to it. His view is, in fact, separable by no perceptible line of distinction from the

[1] Serm. i. pp. 25, 26. [2] p. 26. [3] p. 180; or, 3rd ed. p. 154.

Romish doctrine. The Romanists hold that the bread and wine really become the Body and Blood of Christ, their *substance* giving place to the substance of Christ's Body and Blood, present after a supernatural manner, and their *accidents* only, that is, their colour, form, taste, &c. remaining. This doctrine the Archdeacon expressly recognizes (as we have seen) as a doctrine that *may* be held even by English Churchmen, our Church only requiring us to hold that the accidents remain unchanged; but thinks we may "withhold our judgment" as to whether the presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the elements takes place by the substitution of their substance for that of the Bread and Wine, or in some other way.[1] By this abstinence from definite statements the Archdeacon contrives to throw a cloud over his doctrine, which renders it far more difficult to grasp it by argument than if it was expressly stated—a cloud which he will no doubt withdraw when the time suits. In the meantime we must consider his doctrine as something between consubstantiation and transubstantiation, which he has not yet accurately defined, but which seems to approximate far nearer to the latter than to the former.

But in the examination of the language of Holy Scripture which I am about to institute, I shall endeavour to show, that *both* these views are entirely inconsistent with the testimony of the word of God.

Of the two, I must confess that I had rather have to defend the Romish doctrine than that of Dr. Pusey and Archdeacon Denison; for when we read the words, "This is my Body," it seems a necessary conclusion that they must mean one of these two things,—either, "This is a figure of—represents—my Body," or, "This is really and substantially my Body." But if the doctrine of Dr. Pusey and Archdeacon Denison is the true one, they must be equivalent to saying, "This is bread and my Body together." Now certainly a *compound* of two essentially different things cannot be truly or properly described by a name that belongs only to one of them.

"All things combine," says Dr. Pusey, "to make us take our Lord's words solemnly and literally."[2]

Now, the *literal* interpretation of the words is openly rejected

[1] Doctr. of Euch. pp. 294—296. [2] Serm. p. 26.

by all parties except the extinct sect of the Capernaites. For none others hold that the *material* body and blood of our Lord are literally present, and our Lord's words expressly refer to that material body and blood that suffered on the cross, for they speak of the *body given* and the *blood shed*, which certainly were *material*. "This is my body which is given for you," and "This is my blood which is shed for you." It was *that body* that was given and *that blood* that was shed, that our Blessed Lord referred to.

But neither Dr. Pusey, or the Archdeacons, or the Romanists take these words *body given* and *blood shed* in their literal signification; but fly off to a figment of their own, a species of spiritual body and blood of their own imagining, that are *not* the body that was given and the blood that was shed.

And if they say that they are the body and blood of the risen and exalted Saviour, which, though in some respects changed, may be considered the same as the body and blood that suffered on the cross, I reply that this answer will not hold good, because they imagine our Lord to be in the elements after a different manner even from that in which he exists in heaven, where they admit his presence to be a material and local presence.

And as to what may be considered the *natural* and *obvious* interpretation of the words, I must say that the meaning given to them both by Romanists and the authors under review seems to me to be as far as possible from such an interpretation; and I will endeavour to prove that it is so. That it *may* not be so, I think the reader may at once see by asking himself the question, whether, if a man said of a portrait of the Duke of Wellington, This is the Duke of Wellington, the natural and direct meaning of the words would be, This painting is bodily and substantially the Duke of Wellington, or, a painting and the real Duke of Wellington together. The natural meaning of such words, then, must be determined by the nature of the context, and the subject, and other similar considerations. In fact, as I shall show presently, many of the most eminent of the Romish divines admit, that the doctrine of the Bodily Presence cannot be proved by these words, or by any other passage of Holy Scripture.

Now let us first view the words of institution as they stand in the Evangelists and St. Paul:—

"And as they were eating, Jesus took bread and blessed it (εὐλογήσας) [many MSS. read, *gave thanks*, εὐχαριστήσας] and

brake it and gave it to the disciples, and said, Take, eat; this is my body. And he took the cup, and gave thanks (*εὐχαριστήσας*), and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it: For this is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins. But I say unto you, I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom."[1]

"And as they did eat, Jesus took bread, and blessed (*εὐλογήσας*), and brake it, and gave to them, and said, Take, eat; this is my body. And he took the cup; and when he had given thanks (*εὐχαριστήσας*), he gave it to them: and they all drank of it. And he said unto them, This is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many. Verily I say unto you, I will drink no more of the fruit of the vine, until that day that I drink it new in the kingdom of God."[2]

"And he took bread, and gave thanks (*εὐχαριστήσας*), and brake it, and gave unto them, saying, This is my body, which is given for you: this do in remembrance of me. Likewise also the cup after supper, saying, This cup is the New Testament in my blood, which is shed for you."[3]

"The cup of blessing which we bless (*τὸ ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας ὃ εὐλογοῦμεν*), is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? (*κοινωνία τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ* Χριστοῦ.) The bread, which we break, is it not the communion (*κοινωνία*) of the body of Christ? For we, being many, are one bread and one body; for we are all partakers of that one bread. Behold Israel after the flesh: are not they which eat of the sacrifices partakers of the altar? (*κοινωνοὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου.*) What say I then? that the idol is anything, or that which is offered in sacrifice to idols is anything? But I say, that the things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils, and not to God: and I would not that ye should have fellowship with devils (*κοινωνοὺς τῶν δαιμονίων γίνεσθαι*). Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord, and the cup of devils; ye cannot be partakers of the Lord's table and of the table of devils."[4]

"For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you. That the Lord Jesus, the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread: and when he had given thanks (*εὐχαριστήσας*), he brake it, and said, Take, eat; this is my body, which is broken for you: this do in remembrance of me. After the same manner also he took the cup, when he had supped, saying, This cup is the New Testament in my blood: this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me. For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink

[1] Matt. xxvi. 26—29.
[2] Mark xiv. 22—25.
[3] Luke xxii. 19, 20.
[4] 1 Cor. x. 16—21.

this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come. Wherefore, whosoever shall eat this bread and drink this cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty (ἔνοχος) of the body and blood of the Lord. But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread and drink of that cup. For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning (μὴ διακρίνων) the Lord's body."[1]

To ascertain, then, the meaning of the words "This is my body," &c., let us consider, first, *what it was which our Blessed Lord had in his hands,* when he commenced uttering these words. Either a change was effected in the Bread and Wine *before* he uttered these words, or it was not. If it was *not,* then what he had in his hands when he commenced saying these words was simply *bread* and *wine.* Let us consider this hypothesis first; and it may be well to show the grounds for believing that such was the case.

Now certainly there is nothing in the words of institution, as given by the three Evangelists and St. Paul, that gives any indication that our Lord had done anything to the bread and wine to produce any change in them before this. For though the English reader might at first imagine that the words "blessed it," in St. Matthew's account, might imply something of the kind, yet by observing the word used by the same Evangelist respecting the wine, to which *the same thing* was of course done as to the bread, and there it is merely "gave thanks," and particularly by comparing with it the account given by St. Luke and St. Paul, he will see that it is only equivalent to the word "gave thanks." The meaning to be attached here to the word (εὐλογήσας) translated "blessed," is thus determined to be the same as that indicated by (εὐχαριστήσας) "gave thanks." It is the same word that is used in the accounts given of the miracle of the loaves and fishes, there also translated "blessed," (Matt. xiv. 19; Mark vi. 41, viii. 7,) or "blessed them," (εὐλόγησεν αὐτοὺς, Luke ix. 16,) that is "gave thanks to God for them."[2] And the words, "the cup of blessing which we bless," are interpreted by Œcumenius as meaning "The cup of blessing (ὃ εὐλογοῦντες κατασκευάζομεν) which we prepare with praise

[1] 1 Cor. xi. 23—29.

[2] *Gratias Deo egit pro panibus.* Thus it is translated by Schleusner, who points out that in such passages εὐλογέω is equivalent to εὐχαριστέω. And so

and thanksgiving to God." And hence the bread is called by a writer of almost Apostolical times, Justin Martyr, "bread over which thanksgiving has been uttered."[1]

There is therefore nothing in the words preceding "This is my body," &c., to give the slightest indication that any change had been produced in the bread and wine; except as to their character and use, in that they had been separated by Christ's blessing from common bread and wine, and set apart for a holy use.

Moreover it must have remained bread after the blessing, because our Lord *brake it after* it was blessed. He "blessed it and brake it," &c.

And St. Paul tells us, that "*the* BREAD *which we* BREAK" is "the communion of the body of Christ."

And certainly the most eminent Fathers did not consider any change to have been produced previous to the utterance of these words, for they tell us that it is by these words that the consecration of the bread and wine is effected; and that our Lord had *bread* and *wine* in his hands when he uttered them.

Thus, Tertullian says, that Christ "made the bread that he took and distributed to his disciples his own body, by saying, 'This is my body,' that is, a figure of my body."[2]

Thus also Ambrose says,—

"The Lord Jesus himself exclaims, 'This is my body.' Before the benediction of the heavenly words, it is called a form of a different kind, after the consecration [evidently taking place according to Ambrose by the utterance of the above words] the body is signified. He himself calls it his blood. Before the consecration it is

Stephens in his "Thesaurus" says,—"Christiani theologi εὐχαριστίαν vocarunt mysterium Cœnæ Dominicæ, quod una ex præcipuis ejus partibus sit gratiarum actio, cum qua necessario conjuncta est Dei beneficiorum commemoratio et celebratio. Unde factum est ut apud Evangelistas εὐχαριστεῖν et εὐλογεῖν, et apud quosdam theologos postea εὐχαριστία et εὐλογία pro eodem usurpentur: ex loco illo Pauli in quo sacrum poculum appellat poculum εὐλογίας. Videntur autem hæc omnia expresso Christi mandato niti, quo dicimur in illo mysterio mortem Domini καταγγέλλειν, id est, cum solenni gratiarum actione promulgare et celebrare." Tom. iv. col. 362.

[1] Μεταλαβεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ εὐχαριστηθέντος ἄρτου. JUST. MART. Apol. prim. § 65. ed. Otto. p. 154.

[2] Acceptum panem et distributum discipulis, corpus illum suum fecit, "Hoc est corpus meum" dicendo, id est, figura corporis mei. TERTULL. adv. Marc. iv. 40. Op. ed. Paris. 1664. pp. 457, 458.

said to be something else, after the consecration it is named blood."[1]

And so elsewhere he tells us, that in our celebration of the rite, the consecration is produced by the words of the Lord Jesus, "This is my body," &c., that all that is said before is said by the priest, but "when the holy sacrament is to be made, then the priest uses not his own words, but the words of Christ. The word of Christ makes this sacrament."[2] And again, "Who the day before he suffered, says the Evangelist, "took bread in his holy hands. Before consecration it is "bread; but when the words of Christ have been added, it is "the body of Christ, [the words he refers to being, 'Take, "eat,' &c.]."[3]

So again Chrysostom says,—"'This is my body,' he says. This word transforms what was lying before him."[4] And his words in the context show that he considered these words to have been spoken (as the account given clearly shows them to have been) after the blessing and the breaking of the bread.[5]

Moreover Tertullian, Irenæus, Cyprian, Jerome, and others, tell us that it was *bread* which our Lord called his body, and *wine* which he called his blood.

Thus, Tertullian says,—"Christ calls bread his body."[6]

Irenæus says,—"The Lord taking bread declared it to be his body, and the mixture of the cup he affirmed to be his blood."[7]

[1] Ipse clamat Dominus Jesus: Hoc est corpus meum. Ante benedictionem verborum cœlestium alia species nominatur, post consecrationem corpus significatur. Ipse dicit sanguinem suum. Ante consecrationem aliud dicitur, post consecrationem sanguis nuncupatur. AMBROS. De Myster. § 54. Op. ed. Ben. vol. ii. col. 339, 340.

[2] Ubi venitur ut conficiatur venerabile sacramentum, jam non suis sermonibus utitur sacerdos, sed utitur sermonibus Christi. Ergo sermo Christi hoc conficit sacramentum. AMBROS. De Sacram. lib. 4. c. 4. ib. ii. 368.

[3] Qui pridie, inquit, quam pateretur, in sanctis manibus suis accepit panem. Antequam consecretur, panis est; ubi autem verba Christi accesserint, corpus est Christi. ID. ib. c. 5. col. 371.

[4] Τοῦτό μου ἐστι τὸ σωμά, φησι· τοῦτο τὸ ῥῆμα μεταῤῥυθμίζει τὰ προκείμενα. CHRYSOST. De prodit. Judæ homil. § 6. Op. ed. Ben. tom. ii. p. 384.

[5] Λαβὼν ἄρτον, ἔκλασε καὶ εἶπε· Τοῦτο ἐστι κ. τ. λ. ID. ib. p. 383.

[6] Christus panem corpus suum appellans. TERTULL. adv. Jud. c. 10. Op. ed. Paris. 1664. fol. p. 196.

[7] Accipiens panem suum corpus esse confitebatur, et temperamentum calicis suum sanguinem confirmavit. IREN. adv. hæres. lib. iv. c. 33. § 2. ed. Mass. Paris. p. 270, (or) c. 57. ed. Grab. Oxon. p. 357.

And elsewhere,—The Lord "advising his disciples to offer to "God the first fruits *from his creatures*.... took that which is "bread from the creature and gave thanks, saying, 'This is my "body;' and the cup in like manner, which is from that "creature which is with us, he affirmed to be his blood."[1]

Cyprian says that our Lord "calls bread his body" and "calls wine his blood;"[2] and again, "that it was wine which our Lord called his blood."[3]

Jerome says, that the *bread* which the Lord broke and gave to his disciples was the body of the Saviour.[4]

And Theodoret says, that "in the delivery of the mysteries he called the bread his body and the mixture his blood."[5] And again,—"To the body he gave the name of the symbol, and to the symbol the name of the body."[6]

Nay more, both the Romanists and the authors under review all firmly maintain, that the consecration of the bread and wine takes place *by* the utterance of the words, "This is my body," &c.

Thus, the Roman (or, Tridentine) Catechism, treating of the "form which must be used for the consecration of the bread," says,—

"We are taught by the holy Evangelists, Matthew and Luke, and also by the Apostle, that that form is, 'This is my body.' .... And this form of consecration, as it is observed by Christ the Lord, is always used by the Catholic Church. In this place we may pass over the testimonies of the holy Fathers, which it would be an

[1] Suis discipulis dans consilium, primitias Deo offerre ex suis creaturis.... eum qui ex creatura panis est, accepit, et gratias egit dicens: *Hoc est corpus meum.* Et calicem similiter, qui est ex ea creatura, quæ est secundum nos, suum sanguinem confessus est. Id. ib. c. 17. § 5. ed. Mass. p. 249. (or) c. 32. ed. Grab. p. 323.

[2] Dominus corpus suum panem vocat.... sanguinem suum vinum appellat. Cypr. Epist. ad Magn. 69. ed. Oxon. 1682. p. 182.

[3] Vinum fuisse quod sanguinem suum dixit. Id. Ep. ad Cæcil. 63. ib. p. 152.

[4] Nos audiamus panem quem fregit Dominus deditque discipulis suis esse corpus Domini Salvatoris; ipso dicente ad eos, *Accipite et comedite*, &c. Hieron. Ep. ad Hedibiam. ep. 120. Op. ed. Vallars. tom. i. col. 824.

[5] Ἐν δέ γε τῇ τῶν μυστηρίων παραδόσει, σῶμα τὸν ἄρτον ἐκάλεσε, καὶ αἷμα τὸ κρᾶμα. Theodoret. Dial. 1. *Immutab.* Op. ed. Schulze. Halæ, 1769. et seq. tom. 4. p. 26.

[6] Τῷ μὲν σώματι τὸ τοῦ συμβόλου τέθεικεν ὄνομα· τῷ δὲ συμβόλῳ τὸ τοῦ σώματος. Id. ib.

endless task to enumerate, and the decree of the Council of Florence, which is manifest and ready at hand to all, since we may learn the same more especially from those words of the Saviour, 'This do in remembrance of me.' "[1]

And thus Bellarmine says,—

"The common opinion, not only of more recent divines, but also of the antient Fathers, is, that Christ consecrated by those words, 'This is my body,' 'This is my blood.' For so teach Tertullian, Cyprian, Chrysostom, Ambrose, and others. Moreover, there are very pressing reasons for this. For if the Lord had consecrated in one way, and willed that we should consecrate in another, he would not have said, 'Do this.' "[2] "In the Eucharist, that which makes the sacrament is not human prayers, but the word of the Lord, 'This is my body,' 'This is my blood.' "[3]

And he maintains, that "the Catholic Church teaches that these words *only* are the formal cause of the sacrament," referring to the Council of Florence, the Instruction drawn up for the Armenians, the Catechism of the Council of Trent (or the Roman Catechism), the divines with the Master of the Sentences, lib. 4. dist. 8, and the lawyers on Gratian. De consecr. dist. 2, and on the chapter beginning "Cum Marthæ," in the Extrav. de celebratione Missarum.[4]

And the Greeks, though they do not believe that these words only are necessary to produce the consecration of the bread and wine, yet do not suppose that it takes place before they are pronounced.

Consequently no change can have taken place in the elements till after these words are uttered.

Nay, Archdeacon Denison himself interprets the word "this," as meaning "the *bread* which he had taken and broken after giving thanks."[5]

Consequently it was *bread* which our Lord had in his hands when he said, "This is my body," and therefore the meaning of the word "This" is, *This piece of bread*, and he called the bread his body. Of the *bread* he said, "This *is* my body." He did not say, "I make this bread my body," or, "This bread is

[1] Catech. Rom. P. ii. c. 4. q. 18.
[2] Bellarm. De Euchar. lib. iv. c. 13. Op. Col. 1619. iii. 699.
[3] Id. ib. col. 702.
[4] Id. ib. c. 12. col. 695.
[5] Serm. i. p. 35.

changed into, or, is become, or, shall be, my body," but having *bread* in his hands, and speaking of *it, and of the state in which it then was*, he said that *that bread* was his body.

I ask, then, what is the natural and obvious meaning of these words? Our Lord's words clearly state, that the *bread* he held in his hands was, at the time he spoke, and in the state in which it was when he spoke, *his body*.

Now there is but one way in which bread can *be* the body of Christ, and that is by representation. It *is* the body of Christ as a picture *is* the person whom it represents. There is absolutely no other way of interpreting the words without doing violence to them. There is nothing in the whole account which involves more than a change of *character* and *use*.

Once more, there is still another reason why the word "is" *must* be taken as expressing only "represents" or "is a figure of." For the words of our Lord are that the bread was his *body* BROKEN and the wine his *blood* SHED.[1] Now when our Lord used these words, his body had not been broken nor his blood shed.

The reader will observe that the words are not, This is my body that is *about to be* given, or broken, for you, and This is my blood which is *about to be* shed for you. But, *This is my broken body; This is my blood shed.*

Now the wine could only *represent* the blood shed upon the cross, because that blood was *not shed till afterwards*, and the bread could only *represent* the *broken body* for the same reason.

For the boasted literal interpretation of these words, the wine must have been turned into the very particles of blood that were *afterwards* shed upon the cross, which is as much as saying that what had been drunk by the Apostles at the last supper flowed afterwards from our Blessed Lord's side when hanging on the cross.

The meaning of the words therefore is clear.

We must observe, before we pass on, that figurative language of this kind is very common in Holy Scripture, and this point has been so well and elaborately illustrated by Archdeacon

[1] Τοῦτό μου ἐστὶ τὸ σῶμα τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν κλώμενον. (1 Cor. xi. 24.) Τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ σῶμά μου, τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον—Τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον, ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματί μου, τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυνόμενον. (Luke, xxii. 19, 20.) Τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ αἷμά μου, . . . τὸ περὶ πολλῶν ἐκχυνόμενον. (Matt. xxvi. 28, and Mark xiv. 24.)

Waterland that I think I cannot do better than place before the reader his remarks upon it. After contending for the figurative meaning of these words, "This is my body," he says,—

"I undertake to show that the interpretation here given is favoured by the *general* style or phraseology of Scripture; which abounds with examples of such *figurative* and *constructional* expressions, where one thing is *mentioned* and another *understood*, according to the way which I have before intimated. I do not here refer to such instances as are often produced in this subject; as *metaphorical* locutions, when our Lord is styled a *door*, a *vine*, a *star*, a *sun*, a *rock*, a *lamb*, a *lion*, or the like; which amount only to so many *similitudes* couched, every one respectively, under a single word. Neither do I point to other well-known instances, of *seven kine* being *seven years*, and *four great beasts* being *four kings*, and the *field* being the *world*, *reapers* being *angels*, and the like; which appertain only to *visional* or *parabolical* representations, and come not up to the point in hand. The examples which we are to seek for, as similar and parallel to the expressions made use of by our Lord in the *institution*, must be those wherein some *real thing* is in *just construction* and *certain effect* allowed to be *another thing*.

"Moses *was a God* to Pharaoh (Exod. vii. 1.), not literally, but *in effect*. The walking *tabernacle*, or moving *ark*, being a *symbol* of the Divine presence, was *considered* as God walking among his people. (Lev. xxvi. 11, 12. Deut. xxiii. 14.) *Faith* was reckoned to Abraham as righteousness, or sinless perfection (Gen. xv. 6. Rom. iv. 3, 9, 22. Gal. iii. 6.); not that it strictly or literally was so, but it was so *accepted* in God's account. John the Baptist was Elias, (Matt. xvii. 12. Mark ix. 13), not literally, but in just construction. Man and wife are *one flesh* (1 Cor. vi. 16), not in the utmost strictness of speech, but *interpretatively*, or in effect; they are *considered* as one .... The *Church* is our *Lord's body* (Eph. i. 23.); interpretatively so. Levi paid tithes in Abraham, not literally, but constructionally, or as one *may say*. (Hebr. vii. 9.) Abraham received his son Isaac from the dead, not really, but in just construction, and *in a figure*. (Hebr. xi. 19.) The Apostle tells his new converts; 'Ye are our epistle,' and the 'epistle of Christ' (2 Cor. iii. 2, 3); that is to say, *instead* of an epistle, or *equivalent* thereto; the same thing in effect or use. These examples may suffice to show, in the *general*, that Scripture is no stranger to the *symbolical* or *constructional* language, expressing *one thing* by *another thing*, considered as equivalent thereto, and amounting to the same as to real effects or purposes.

"This will appear still plainer from the *sacrificial* language and

usage in the Old Testament. *Blood*, in sacrificial language, was the *life* of an animal: and the shedding the blood for sacrifice, together with the sprinkling it, were understood to be giving *life* for *life*. (Gen. ix. 4. Levit. xvii. 10, 11.) The *fumes* of some sacrifices were *considered* as *sweet odours* (Gen. viii. 21. Exod. xxix. 18. et passim), grateful to God when sent up with a pure mind. The *altar* was considered as *God's table* (Ezek. xli. 22. xliv. 16. Mal. i. 7, 12): and what was *offered* upon it, and consumed by *fire*, was construed and accepted as *God's meat, bread, food, portion*, or *mess*. (Levit. iii. 11. xxi. 6, 8, 17, 21, 22, 25. Numb. xxviii. 2, 24. Ezek. xliv. 7.) Not that it was *literally* so, but it was all one to the supplicants; with whom God dealt as kindly as if it had really been so: it was the same thing in legal *account*, was *symbolically* the same, and therefore so *named*. The *laying hands* upon the *head* of the victim was, in *construction* of Divine law, *transferring* the legal offences upon the victim (Levit. i. 4. viii. 14, 15): more particularly, the people's performing that ceremony towards the *scape-goat* was considered as *laying* their *iniquities* upon him, which accordingly the goat was supposed to *bear away* with him (Levit. xvi. 21, 22): all which was true in *legal* account. The priests, in eating the *sin-offering* of the people, were considered as eating up their guilt, incorporating it with themselves, and discharging the people of it (Levit. x. 17. Hos. iv. 8): and the *effect* answered. But when the people feasted on the *peace-offerings*, it was symbolically eating *peace*, and maintaining amity with God: to which St. Paul alludes in a noted passage (1 Cor. x. 18. Compare Levit. vii. 18. and Ainsworth in loc.), to be explained hereafter. From hence it may be observed, by the way, that *symbolical* phrases and *symbolical* services were what the Jews had been much and long used to, before our Lord's time: which may be one reason why the Apostles shewed no surprise at what was said to them in the *institution* of the Eucharist, nor called for any explanation.

"From the Jewish *sacrifices*, we may pass on to their *sacraments*, which, taking the word in a large sense, were *many*, but in the stricter sense were but *two*, namely *Circumcision* and the *Passover*. With respect to those also, the like *figurative* and *symbolical* language prevailed. We find St. Paul declaring of the *manna* and of the *waters* of old, that they were *spiritual* food; and accordingly he does not scruple, while speaking of the *rock* from whence the waters flowed, to say that 'that rock was Christ.' (1 Cor. x. 4.) It typified Christ, yea and more than so, the *waters* which it yielded, typified the blood and water which should afterwards flow from our Lord's *side*, and were to the *faithful* of that time *spiritual* pledges of the *benefits* of Christ's passion, like as the sacramental *wine* is

now. This consideration fully accounts for the strong expression which the Apostle in that case made use of, 'that rock was Christ:' it was so in effect to every *true* Israelite of that time.

"Circumcision of the *flesh* was a *symbolical* rite, betokening the true *circumcision* of the *heart;* which was the *condition* of the *covenant* between God and his people, on their part (Deut. x. 16. xxx. 6. Levit. xxvi. 41. Jerem. iv. 4. Rom. ii. 28, 29), and God's *acceptance* of the same on his part (Gen. xvii. 7), to all saving purposes: therefore circumcision had the name of *covenant*, and the *sign* was called what it *literally* was not, but what it really and truly *signified*, and to the faithful *exhibited*. (Gen. xvii. 10, 13, 14.)

"The like may be observed of the *Passover*, which was feasting upon a *lamb*, but was called *the Lord's Passover*, as looking backwards, plainly, to the angel's *passing over* the Hebrews, so as to preserve them from the *plague* then inflicted on the Egyptians (Exod. xii. 11, 12, 13), and mystically looking forward to God's *passing over* the sins of mankind, for the sake of Christ the true *paschal lamb*. (1 Cor. v. 7.) Such is the customary language of Scripture in those cases, denominating the *signs* by the things *signified*, and at the same time *exhibited* in a qualified sense.

"I proceed to the consideration of *Baptism*, a sacrament of the New Testament, a *symbolical* rite, full of figure and mystery; *representing* divers graces, blessings, privileges, and *exhibiting* the same in the very act: for which reason the Scripture language concerning it is very strong and emphatical, like to what our Lord made use of with respect to the Eucharist. St. Paul does not barely intimate that we *ought to be* buried with Christ in baptism, or that we *signify* his burial, but he says plainly, *we are buried;* and likewise that we *have been planted* together in the likeness of his death, and that our old man *is crucified*, and that we are *freed from sin*, and *dead with Christ*. (Rom. vi. 4, 6, 7, 8.) The reason is, because the things there mentioned are not merely *represented*, but *effectuated* always on God's part, if there be no failure or obstacle on ours. The *spiritual* graces of Baptism go along with the ceremony, in the *due* use of it, and are supposed by the Apostle to be conveyed at that instant. 1. Actual remission of sins. (Acts xxii. 16. ii. 38. Col. ii. 13. 1 Cor. vi. 11.) 2. Present sanctification of the Spirit. (John iii. 5. Acts ii. 38. 1 Cor. xii. 13. vi. 11. Ephes. v. 26. Tit. iii. 5. Hebr. x. 22.) 3. Actual communion with Christ's body, with Christ our head. (1 Cor. xii. 13.) 4. A certain title, for the time being, to *resurrection* and *salvation*. (Rom. vi. 8, 9. Tit. iii. 5. 1 Pet. iii. 21, &c. . . .) 5. A putting on Christ. (Gal. iii. 27.) I take the more notice here of the last article of *putting on Christ*, as being of near affinity with *feeding upon Christ* in the other sacrament. Both of them express a near conjunction and close intimacy: but

the latter is the *stronger* figure, and the more *affecting* emblem. Christ is, in a qualified sense, our *clothing*, and our *food;* our baptismal *garment*, and our eucharistical *banquet:* but what enters *within us*, and is *diffused* all over us, and becomes *incorporate* with us, being considered as a *symbol* of Christ, expresses the most intimate union and coalition imaginable. Probably this *symbol* was made choice of for the *Eucharist*, as it is the top perfection of Christian worship or service. Baptism is for *babes* in Christ, this for *grown men:* Baptism *initiates*, while the Eucharist *perfects:* Baptism *begins* the spiritual life, the Eucharist carries on and *finishes* it. And therefore it is that the Eucharist has so frequently been called τὸ τέλειον, the *perfecting* service, and the *Sacrament of sacraments;* or emphatically *the Sacrament*, which obtains at this day. I may add, that, though Baptism represents the *burial* and the *resurrection* of our Lord, and entitles us to a partnership in both, yet there is something still more awful and venerable in representing (not merely his *acts* or *offices*, but) his very *Person*, in part, which is done in the Eucharist, by the symbols of bread and wine, representing his *body* and *blood*.

"From what hath been said under this last article concerning Baptism, we may observe, that it is not *literally* going into the grave with Christ, neither is it *literally* rising from the dead with him; but it is so *interpretatively* and in certain *effect*, proper dispositions supposed on our part: and it is not barely a *representation* of a thing, but a real *exhibition*. So likewise in the Eucharist: the elements are not literally what they are called, but they are *interpretatively* and *in effect* the same thing with what they stand for. Such appears to be the true account of the *symbolical* phrases of the institution."[1]

To these remarks it seems unnecessary to add a word.

Nor are we without good Patristical authority for this interpretation of the words. For this Tertullian and Augustine may suffice.

Thus, Tertullian in the passage not long since quoted[2] interprets the words "This is my body" as follows,—"That is, a figure of my body."

And Augustine says,—"The Lord hesitated not to say, 'This is my body,' when he was giving a sign of his body."[3]

[1] Waterland's Review of doctrine of Eucharist, chapt. 7. Works, ed. Oxf. 1843. vol. 4. pp. 574—579.

[2] See p. 62 above.

[3] Non enim Dominus dubitavit dicere, Hoc est corpus meum, cum signum daret corporis sui. AUGUST. Lib. contr. Adimant. c. 12, § 3. Op. ed. Ben. Antw. viii. 90.

And now let us consider the way in which the Romanists and our authors meet the difficulties in the way of their boasted literal interpretation. According to the doctrine of the former, the words would mean,—This bread is not bread, but instead of it is my Body. According to the notions of the latter, they mean, —This bread is not bread only, but bread and my Body joined together.

And the "*body*" spoken of in both cases is a spiritual immaterial thing, neither like the body crucified, nor the body glorified as it exists in heaven, but a second body whose existence is imagined for the purpose of making a presence of the body in the elements!

Anything more unlike a natural or *literal* interpretation of the words than either of these representations of their meaning, I cannot imagine.

And the latter is the worst of the two. For while our Lord says that *the bread* he held in his hands was his body, this interpretation maintains that the bread was not his body, but that his body was joined to the bread. It is therefore in direct opposition to the plain meaning of our Lord's words.

And I would earnestly beg the reader's particular consideration of this part of the Scripture argument on the subject, because I am convinced that the more it is examined, the more thoroughly eversive it will be found to be of the doctrine of the Romanists and our authors on this subject, and of their boasted argument, —their Achilles in this controversy—of taking our Lord's words in their plain and literal meaning.

Even the great Coryphæus of Roman controversialists, Cardinal Bellarmine, admits, that if it was bread our Lord had in his hands when he spoke these words, so that the word "This" refers to a piece of bread, the words can only mean, This bread represents my body. For thus he speaks:—"In the same place "he [*i.e.* Luther] wrote, that the words of the Evangelist, 'This "is my body,' mean this: 'This bread is my body.' AND THIS "SENTENCE EITHER MUST BE UNDERSTOOD FIGURATIVELY, THAT "BREAD IS THE BODY OF CHRIST SIGNIFICATIVELY, OR IT IS "PLAINLY ABSURD AND IMPOSSIBLE, FOR IT CANNOT POSSIBLY BE "THAT BREAD SHOULD BE THE BODY OF CHRIST."[1] And this

[1] Ibidem scripsit, verba Evangelistæ: Hoc est corpus meum, hunc facere sensum: Hic panis est corpus meum. Quæ sententia aut accipi debet tropice, ut

admission he repeats in another place, where he says, that such a proposition as this,—"This true and wheaten bread is truly and properly my body"—cannot be admitted, for "in an affir-"mative proposition it is necessary that the subject and the "predicate refer to the same thing, otherwise what is predicated "would be false. Therefore it cannot be that the proposition "should be true in which the subject stands for bread, and the "predicate for the body of Christ; for bread and the body of "Christ are most different things."[1]

Nothing can be more true than these remarks of Cardinal Bellarmine, and they concede all we want for a reply to their boastings that their doctrine arises out of the plain straightforward literal interpretation of our Lord's words.

And we shall find, when we examine the matter further, that both the Romanists and the authors under review, instead of giving a simple and literal interpretation to the words as they find them, are driven to the most desperate shifts and inconsistencies to get their doctrine out of them. For, as we have already seen, they stoutly contend that the bread and wine are not consecrated until the words are pronounced, "This is my body," &c., and therefore that they do not become the body and blood of Christ until *after* these words are pronounced; and at the same time it is clear, and admitted by Bellarmine, that if our Saviour had true bread and wine in his hands when he began speaking these words, they must be understood figuratively.

How then are they to escape from this difficulty? Let us first consider Bellarmine's mode of evading it.

We may observe, first, that he tells us that our Lord *consecrated* the bread when he *blessed* it, and that the *benediction* is in fact the *consecration*,[2] but being fettered by his own doctrine that consecration is effected by the words, "This is my body," &c., he boldly affirms, that *the blessing was given by pronouncing these*

panis sit corpus Christi significative, aut est plane absurda et impossibilis; nec enim fieri potest, ut panis sit corpus Christi. De Euchar. i. 1. Op. ed. Col. Agripp. 1619. iii. 390.

[1] In propositione affirmativa necesse est, ut pro eodem supponant subjectum et prædicatum: alioqui esset falsa prædicatio. Non igitur potest fieri, ut vera sit propositio, in qua subjectum supponit pro pane, prædicatum autem pro corpore Christi: panis enim et corpus Domini res diversissimæ sunt. Ib. iii. 19. col. 620. And see also c. 23, col. 637, 8.

[2] See De Euchar. lib. iii. c. 23, and lib. iv. c. 13.

*words*. "The blessing," he says, "either was given in these "words, This is my body, and, This is my blood, as the Roman "Catechism and divines commonly teach, or certainly it is not "to be found in the Gospel in what words the Lord gave his "blessing."[1] "Christ did not bless and break the bread without uttering any words, but by saying, 'This is my body.'"[2]

And so the *Roman Catechism* maintains, that by the phrase "blessed" the bread, we are to understand that Christ "blessed the bread, saying, 'This is my body.'"[3]

Now into the abstract question whether the "blessing" or "giving thanks over" the bread was its consecration, I shall not here enter; but that the blessing was given by the utterance of these words is an interpretation of the passage which, instead of being its plain and obvious meaning, is just the contrary. For the blessing of the bread clearly took place *before* the breaking of it, as the tenses used show, and the words "This is my body," &c. were used when, *after* it had been broken, our Lord was giving it to his disciples; and for the notion that they had been spoken before on the blessing of the bread, there is not the slightest evidence or probability. Indeed it has been already proved, by a comparison of the different accounts, that the "blessing" spoken of was only "giving thanks" over the bread, and such words as "This is my body," &c. would not be applicable for giving thanks.

And still further; if these words were spoken when our Lord "*blessed*" or rather *gave thanks over* the bread, we must suppose from the narrative, that they were uttered twice over, for we are plainly told that they were spoken when our Lord gave the bread and wine to his disciples. And so, the words would have to be interpreted, that our Lord "took bread, and having said over it, 'This is my body,' brake it, and gave it to his disciples, saying, 'This is my body,'" &c.

This seems a singular mode of commencing the *literal* inter-

[1] Benedictio autem aut illis verbis facta est: 'Hoc est corpus meum,' et, 'Hic est sanguis meus,' ut Catechismus Romanus et Theologi communius docent, aut certe in Evangelio non habetur, quibus verbis Dominus benedixerit. De Euchar. lib. iv. c. 13, col. 698.

[2] Christus non benedixit et fregit panem sine ulla prolatione verborum, sed dicendo, Hoc est corpus meum. Ib. col. 699.

[3] Quod ab Evangelista dictum est, *Benedixit* .... perinde videtur intelligendum ac si dixisset; accipiens panem benedixit, dicens, Hoc est corpus meum. CATECH. ROM. P. 2. c. 4. q. 18.

pretation of the words. And what aid Bellarmine gains for his cause by it, I cannot imagine. For it follows necessarily from it, that nothing had been done to the bread previous to the utterance of the supposed words of consecration, "This is my body," &c. And therefore our Lord must have had a piece of bread in his hands. And yet Bellarmine denies that the word "This" refers to a piece of bread. By this interpretation, therefore, he merely pushes his difficulty one step further back.

But what, it will be asked, does he consider the word "This" to mean? The following is his answer to this question. After having disposed of several senses of the word as untenable, he adds,—

"There is therefore another opinion, that of St. Thomas, and many others who follow him, that the pronoun 'This' does not point out precisely the bread, nor the body, but generally (in communi) the substance which is under those forms; yet so nevertheless as that the pointing out (demonstratio) belongs properly to the forms: not indeed that the sense should be, 'This,' that is, these forms are my body; but indirectly (in obliquo), in this way: 'This is my body,' that is, Under these forms is my body.....Hence their argument is excellently answered. For when they say, 'This' points out the bread, therefore the bread is the body of Christ, but it cannot be so properly, therefore it is figuratively: I reply, that that word 'This' does not point out the bread precisely (præcise), but what is contained under those forms, which indeed although it was bread before consecration, yet by the power of those words begins to be the body of the Lord." [1]

And again, in another place, his explanation of the word "This" is as follows:—

"That in this proposition [This is my body] the forms or accidents are formally pointed out, which are certain and determinate, although, as I have said, indirectly not directly. Wherefore we do not say, *This*, that is, this substance, or this entity with Scotus, but *This*, that is, the substance under these forms, so that the demonstrative pronoun points to the forms, not to the substance: but there is a difference between these two, *This*, that is, this substance, and *This*, that is, the substance under these forms. Inasmuch as if you say *This*, that is, this substance, it is necessary that that substance should be then present when the word *This* is spoken, and yet the substance of the body of Christ is not then present, and the demonstration is rendered false. But if you

[1] Bellarm. De Euchar. lib. i. c. 11. 4.

say, *This*, that is, the substance under these forms, it is not necessary that that substance should then be present, but it is sufficient if the forms are present which are pointed out by the pronoun *This*. And this will be clearer if, not expressing the substance, you say, *This is my body*, that is, under these forms is my body." [1]

So that the pronoun *This* points to the forms or accidents, but means the substance under them, and yet not that substance which *is* under them, but that which is *about to be*. And so he would make out that the word may be used of that which is actually not present. For he is compelled to admit that the body of Christ is not then present, the consecratory words necessary to cause its presence not having been uttered.

Such are the monstrous absurdities to which even learned men may be driven in order to support a favorite dogma!

And I would ask, how it was that the substance of the bread had vanished to make room for the body of Christ. Our Lord, when he used the word "*This*," certainly spoke of that which he had in his hands, and what he took up from the table was *bread*, for that we are expressly told by the sacred writers. What right have we then to say, without any evidence or authority for such a supposition, that the substance of the bread had vanished before the word "This" was pronounced?

The sole argument that Bellarmine can produce that the word "This" does not mean *This piece of bread* is, that the word for bread in Greek is of the masculine gender and the word *this* is expressed in the neuter gender! [2] As if every schoolboy did not know that an inanimate substance might properly be so referred to by a neuter pronoun!

And, indeed, when the bread was broken up into fragments (κλάσματα. See Mark viii. 8, &c.) to represent the broken body, and one of these fragments was given, it would seem that (τοῦτο) "This," in the neuter gender, was the word that would necessarily be used.

And, as might be supposed, this difficulty has scattered the Romish doctors to the four winds to seek for a satisfactory solution, and great is the variety and self-contradiction that exist between them in their attempts to solve it. After all their boastings of taking the words in their plain literal meaning, we

[1] Bellarm. De Euchar. lib. i. c. 11. § Ad id vero. Op. ed. cit. tom. iii. col. 436.
[2] De Euchar. lib. i. c. 10. col. 425.

have only to ask them what the first word "This" means, to involve them in an inextricable difficulty and find them all at variance with one another.

I will give a few specimens.

Gerson honestly says that the word "This" signifies "the substance of bread."[1] With him, therefore, we may leave Bellarmine to deal, and to show him that he has ruined his own cause. But others say, that the word "This" means not bread, but the body of Christ; so that according to them the change had taken place somehow before these words were uttered.

To remedy the inconveniences therefore of either of these interpretations, the ingenuity of the doctors was put on the rack to devise *something between the two*, to which the word "This" might refer. Accordingly, Johannes de Burgo maintains that the word "This" means "This that is present under this form, or shortly will be, is my body."[2] But Holcot more learnedly describes it as "something that is common to each *terminus* [i. e. both to the bread, and the body of Christ]; both to the *terminus a quo*, and the *terminus ad quem*."[3]

And thus our Romish Bishop Gardiner described it as denoting neither bread nor the body of Christ, but *individuum vagum*, *individuum in genere*, *individuum entis*, *individuum individui*, &c.,[4] which I can only translate by the words *an indescribable something*.

And therefore others, finding description hopeless, maintained, as Durandus tells us, that by the word "This," "nothing particular is signified, but it is put to signify generally some sort of thing."[5]

To avoid these difficulties Pope Innocent III. fairly gave up the notion that Christ consecrated the bread by uttering the words, "This is my body," and maintained that we should get

[1] Demonstrat substantiam panis. GERSON. Contra Floret. lib. iv. Op. Lugd. 1499. fol. 95.

[2] Hoc sub hac specie præsens, vel de propinquo futurum, est corpus meum. JOAN. DE BURGO, Pupill. Ocul. Pt. iv. c. 4. ed. Argent. 1518. fol. 19.

[3] Quiddam utrique termino commune; et termino, a quo, et termino ad quem. R. HOLKOT. Super Quat. libr. Sentent. lib. 4. q. 3. ed. Lugd. 1497. fol. m. vii.

[4] MAR. ANTON. CONSTANT. Confut. Cavill. in ven. Euch. Sacr. verit. Par. 1552. Ad object. xiii., xiv., xv. fol. 9 et seq. et 19—21.

[5] Super hoc dicunt quidam, quod per pronomen *hoc* nihil demonstratur; sed illud materialiter ponitur. DURAND. Rat. div. Offic. lib. iv. c. 41. § 44. ed. Lugd. 1565. fol. 167.

over all difficulties by saying, that he "made the sacrament when he blessed the elements,"[1] evidently not holding that the blessing was given by the utterance of these words; but then as it was necessary for him to assert that the consecration is *now* performed by the utterance of these words, he tells us, that "it "certainly may be said, that Christ made the sacrament by his "Divine power, and *afterwards* expressed the form with which "those who came after him should bless the elements."[2]

Hence the learned Catharinus exclaimed, when writing on this subject, "Consider, reader, into what difficulties they are "thrown, who go about to write upon this matter, when the "word 'This' only has had so many and such contradictory "expositions, that they are enough to make a man lose his wits, "but barely to consider them all."[3]

Now it would be cruel to deny these learned doctors the credit of ingenuity; but whether any other credit is due to them, I leave the reader to determine. But I must say, that before the maintainers of such a doctrine boast of receiving our Lord's words "This is my body" in their plain literal meaning, they should be prepared with a *reasonable* reply to the question, What is the meaning of the first word, "This;" and considering their claims to unity and infallibility in such matters, should also *agree* in their answer.

And we must observe that precisely the same difficulty holds against the doctrine of the union of the body of Christ with the bread. What does the word "This" mean? If it means "This piece of bread," then it is absurd to say that the literal meaning of the words "This is my body" is, "This piece of bread is bread and my body together." In fact, it would be making the words self-contradictory, for the bread is *not* supposed to be Christ's body, but only joined to it. If again it does *not* mean, "This piece of bread," and yet the body of Christ is not present till after the words are pronounced (as is maintained), *what is it?*

[1] Ab hujus ergo quæstionis laqueo facile se absolvit, qui dicit, quod Christus tunc confecit quum benedixit. INNOCENT. PAP. III. De myst. miss. lib. iv. c. 17. Op. Col. 1575. tom. i. p. 384.

[2] Sane dici potest, quod Christus virtute divina confecit; et postea formam expressit, sub qua posteri benedicerent. ID. ib. c. 6. p. 377.

[3] As cited by Abp. Wake, Disc. of Holy Eucharist, p. 18.

But the authors with whom I am now more especially concerned run into the inconsistency I have spoken of without apparently being at all conscious of it. Borne along by their desire to establish their favorite doctrine, they have forgotten to make the arguments by which they support it consistent with one another. Thus, Archdeacon Wilberforce tells us, that "this" means "that which *was* consecrated, or set apart," that is, by our Lord's previous blessing; and from this supposed fact derives his foundation principle that "consecration is the essential characteristic of the Holy Eucharist," and that what has been thus consecrated is something very different from what it was before.[1] But he seems wholly to have forgotten, that according to his own views, when the word "this" was pronounced, the bread had *not* been consecrated, for he holds, with the great body of the Romanists, that the words "This is my Body" are the words of consecration.[2] This mistake is fatal to his argument.

But of this vital flaw in his reasoning he seems wholly unconscious. He grounds his whole argument upon the notion that "the relation between the subject and the predicate in our Lord's words of institution, is that of sacramental identity," by which he says "is meant, that the outward and inward parts, the *sacramentum* and *res sacramenti*, are united by the act of consecration into a compound whole."[3] And in a note here in the 3rd edition he says,—"Hence we have an answer to the "question, what does the word *Hoc* express in our Lord's words "of institution? It refers directly to the *res sacramenti*, indi-"rectly to the *sacramentum* also." Consequently, to make "hoc" express this meaning, we must suppose the act of consecration to have taken place before these words were pronounced; and so the Archdeacon in some places intimates. But *in the very same page* we find the following words,—"Such "was the efficacy of our Lord's original benediction; such con-"tinues to be the force of *the same words*, when pronounced by "Him through the mouth of his ministers. For they are "creative words; like those which called the world into ex-"istence, they effect that which they declare." Here he has completely forgotten that in order to give an answer to the

[1] P. 9, et seq.
[2] Ib. pp. 64, 65, &c.
[3] Ib. p. 120, or 102, 3rd ed.

question what the word (hoc) "This" means, he had elsewhere supposed a change to have been effected in the bread previous to the utterance of the words, "This is my body."

Such are the palpable inconsistencies in which he has involved his argument.

Archdeacon Denison does the same thing, for while he evidently supposes that the consecration of the elements was by the words "This is my body," &c., and came after the benediction, yet in his Table in the Appendix, he places the "consecration" at the word "gave thanks."[1]

Both these authors no doubt felt the difficulty in which they would be involved by the admission that the word "this" referred to *a simple piece of bread*, and so have involved themselves in an inconsistency which presents, I humbly think, a greater difficulty for them to contend with.

So much for the boastings of the maintainers of transubstantiation or consubstantiation, that *they* understand the words of our Lord in their plain, literal sense.

But now let us even suppose, for the sake of argument, that the change imagined *had* taken place *before* our Lord commenced uttering the words "This is my Body," &c., and that the bread had become, according to Archdeacon Denison's notion, *bread and Christ's body joined together*. Then the word "This" meant a thing that was *bread and Christ's body joined together*, and our Lord's words are, "This (bread and my body joined together) is my body." And this we are told is taking the words in their *literal* meaning!

There is more to be said even for the Romish doctrine than for this, because if a change had taken place, and the substance of the bread had given place to the substance of Christ's body, there would be no absurdity in saying, "This is my body." But the Romanists preclude themselves from this solution of the difficulty by maintaining that the body of Christ is not present till these words are pronounced. And if they ever changed their ground, and said that the elements were changed by the benediction previous to the utterance of these words,

[1] Serm. i. Append. pp. 49, 50.

then we might reply, that not only are the elements called bread and the fruit of the vine after consecration and distribution to the communicants, but that in the case of the wine, the expression used, as given by St. Luke and St. Paul, directly forbids this mode of interpretation, for it is, "This cup is the New Testament in my blood." In what way alone these words can be interpreted with any show of reason, it is needless to point out, and from this we necessarily infer the meaning of the other form of expressing the same thing.

I fully agree therefore with Dr. Pusey, that "we should believe that a testator means what he says," and that "reverence for the word of God requires, that we should not tamper with its apparent meaning, on any preconceived notions of our own."[1] And on these grounds I ask him not to interpret our Lord's words in a sense which does obvious violence to them.

And I would beg him to weigh the following words of one for whom I believe he professes great respect, I mean Bishop Jeremy Taylor.

"In Scripture," says the Bishop, "it is as plainly affirmed to be bread, as it is called Christ's body. Now then because it *cannot be both* in the proper and natural sense, but one of them must be *figurative and tropical*, since both of the appellatives are equally affirmed, is it not notorious that in this case we ought to give judgment on that side which we are prompted to by common sense? If Christ had said only, This is my body, and no Apostle had told us also that it is bread, we had reason to suspect our senses to be deceived, if it were possible they should be: but when it is equally affirmed to be bread, as to be our Lord's body, and but one of them can be naturally true and in the letter, shall the testimony of all our senses be absolutely of no use in casting the balance? The two affirmatives are equal; ONE MUST BE EXPOUNDED TROPICALLY: which will you choose? Is there in the world anything more certain and expedite than that what you see and feel and taste natural and proper, should be judged to be that which you see and feel and taste naturally and properly, and therefore that the other be expounded tropically? Since you *must expound one of the words tropically*, I think it is not hard to determine whether you ought to do it against your sense or with it."[2]

[1] P. 29.

[2] The Real Presence, &c., Lond. 1654, 8vo. pp. 173, 174.

Dr. Pusey's attempt[1] to illustrate his interpretation of the phrase "This is my Body" by other passages of Holy Scripture, and to prove that the words "my Body" may be used of that which is bread and Christ's body joined together, is clearly a failure. He adduces the phrases, "Man became a living soul," "This is now bone of my bone, &c.," "The Word became Flesh," "To those who believe, to them gave He power to become the sons of God," "The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ," as instances of the same mode of speaking, inasmuch as Adam had a body *as well as* a soul, and Eve had a soul *as well as* the bone and flesh spoken of, and so on. But not one of these instances is in point, for the words are spoken as descriptive of what had taken place previous to their utterance, and therefore present a very different case from that of our Lord saying of a piece of bread, "This *is* my Body."

The phrases, to have been applicable, should have been of a similar kind, and spoken under similar circumstances. It should have been shown, that *before* man became a living soul, it was said, "Man *is* a living soul," and that by these words he became so; and so with the others. And the last two instances merely refer to the assumption of a new *character* by what is spoken of.

Still further, if the words "my body" are used to describe a thing which is bread and Christ's body also, then there is a figure in the words, namely, a synecdoche, as Brentius and Andreæ admitted; which is the very thing so strenuously denied by Dr. Pusey, who insists upon their being taken *literally*. So that when we come to examine Dr. Pusey's (so called) *literal* interpretation of the words, we find that it is anything but *literal:* for, in the first place, he maintains a synecdoche in the words "my body," which he tells us describe a thing which is bread and Christ's body joined together; and secondly, when we inquire what he means by the word "body," we find that he understands by it a thing without parts or dimensions, an immaterial nondescript entity, a body of his own imagining, which he has divested of all the characteristics of a body, because he cannot make the existence of those

[1] Sermon, pp. 17, 18.

characteristics in his supposed body square with his hypothesis.

Here, then, I must beg to contend for the *literal* sense against Dr. Pusey and the Archdeacons, and the Romanists too. When our Lord used the words "my body," especially when he added to it the words "which is given for you," I believe he meant literally what he said; that is, that he meant that material body that he took on his incarnation: and therefore that, by the words "This is my body that is given for you," he meant that the bread represented that *true material body* which was about to suffer on the cross. I maintain that there is not a shadow of ground for saying, either that there is any synecdoche in these words, or that they mean anything else than what their *literal* signification implies, namely, the body that was crucified. And I maintain, that the Body and Blood of Christ that we are to eat and drink in the Lord's Supper, are the true material body and blood of our Blessed Lord, of which he spake when he said of himself to his disciples after his resurrection,—"a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have." But I contend that this eating and drinking are of a spiritual kind, the acts of the soul only; but, in the case of the faithful, accompanying the eating and drinking of the sacred symbols by the mouth.

But Dr. Pusey, to raise a prejudice against that interpretation of the words for which we contend, inserts in it a phrase out of his own head, of which he then avails himself to find fault with the interpretation. He says it is "an unauthorized inference from our Lord's words," that they mean only, "This represents, is a figure of, my *absent* Body."[1] But who authorized him to insert the word "absent?" No one maintains that the words imply all this. Whether the Body is present or absent in the Supper, is a question not determined by these words. The Body might be present even materially, and yet not in the Bread. The "unauthorized inference," therefore, from these words, is one of Dr. Pusey's own invention.

And I must add, that as to any spiritual presence, our Lord may be present *in the Supper*, and quite as effectually present, though he does not enter into or become annexed to the earthly elements of bread and wine. Dr. Pusey himself is compelled

[1] p. 25.

to hold that Christ is not *materially* present; and therefore, as to any such presence as Dr. Pusey is permitted by his Church to hold, our Lord may be really present to the receiver without going into the bread and wine first. But it is in this way that the general reader is misled by the tacit identification of the non-presence of Christ's Body *in* the bread and wine with his absence from the rite.

And when Dr. Pusey tells the world,[1] that "the Calvinistic theory" is, that the Body and Blood mean "the fruit and efficacy of the death of the Lord," and that "even Beza" says of this "Calvinistic theory," that it is absurd, it would really be wasting the reader's time to do more than point out how utterly impossible it is, in the face of such passages, to place confidence in Dr. Pusey's statements in such matters. If even the well-known sentiments of Calvin, as elaborately laid down in his "Institutions" and elsewhere, are so misrepresented, and such a staunch follower of Calvin as Beza is quoted in this way, what may the reader expect in points less known?

But out of the words of St. Paul, above quoted, another argument is drawn.[2] It is urged that we are there told, that the bread is "the communion of the Body of Christ," and the wine "the communion of the Blood of Christ." And hence the conclusion is drawn, that the Body of Christ must be in the Bread we eat, and his Blood in the Wine we drink, otherwise there could not be this communion. That is, there cannot be this communion with the Body and Blood of Christ through the bread and wine, unless we eat and drink them with our mouth in conjunction with the bread and wine. But neither the words nor the context will bear out this sense. That a participation by the faithful of the bread and wine produces spiritual communion with the Body and Blood of Christ, is what we do not deny; nor are we desirous of dogmatizing as to the precise way in which the presence of Christ is vouchsafed to the believing soul, except that it is not by his having taken up his abode in bread and wine to be eaten and drunk by us (an earthly, debasing, and unscriptural notion, leading to all manner of abuses and false doctrine); and this is all which can be de-

[1] Sermon, p. 32.

[2] See Dr. Pusey's Sermon, pp. 32, 33.

duced from this passage. For it is not said, *how* the bread produces communion with the Body of Christ. It is entirely unnecessary for its being instrumental in producing this, that the Body of Christ should be really joined to the Bread. Why (so far as this passage is concerned) should not the presence, whatever it be, be vouchsafed at once to the communicant, instead of passing through the bread? But the context absolutely negatives the notion, that because it is said that he who eats the bread enjoys the "communion of the Body of Christ," therefore the Body of Christ must be eaten by the mouth with the Bread. For the word used is exactly the same as that which is afterwards employed (v. 20.) to describe the "fellowship," or communion, "with devils," which those have who eat of the sacrifices offered to them. Those who eat with faith the consecrated bread, enjoy communion with Christ; and those who eat what is offered in sacrifice to idols, have communion with devils. But the Body of Christ is no more eaten with the mouth to obtain that communion with him, than the bodies of devils are eaten to obtain *their* communion. That which is eaten is instrumental in producing that communion in both cases, but not as bringing the object communicated into the mouth; which is a low and gross idea, utterly unworthy of the subject.

A third argument raised out of these passages is founded on St. Paul's words, — "Whosoever shall eat this bread and drink this cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord." (ἔνοχος τοῦ σώματος καὶ αἵματος τοῦ Κυρίου.) .... "He that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning (μὴ διακρίνων) the Lord's Body."[1] It is argued from this, that the Body and Blood of the Lord are so joined to the Bread and Wine, that they are received by the wicked as well as the faithful in the Lord's Supper.

But it is difficult to understand how any proof of such a doctrine can be deduced from this passage. For the utmost that the words "guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord" can be made to mean in that direction is, "guilty of an offence against the Body and Blood of Christ." The same phrase is used James ii. 10, where it is said, that he who offends against one

[1] See Denison's Serm. i. pp. 36, 37; and Wilberforce, p. 180.

point in the law, γέγονε πάντων ἔνοχος, "is guilty of all," i. e. is guilty of offending against the whole law.

Now, whether the Bread and Wine are the Body and Blood of Christ, or only consecrated symbols of that Body and Blood, he who eats and drinks unworthily is guilty of an offence against the Body and Blood of Christ. And therefore this passage proves nothing as to the doctrine in question.

This is admitted by Olshausen, though a Lutheran. He says,—"The fact that the consecrated elements are here "denominated bread and wine, proves sufficiently that the Ca- "tholic doctrine of transubstantiation is entirely unscriptural. "But it is just as certain that concerning the manner of Christ's "presence in the holy communion, nothing further can be "drawn from this passage." And he adds,—"That the un- "believing communicant receives the body and blood of Christ "in itself, is not sanctioned by the words." (In loc.)

And so again as to the words—"Not discerning the Lord's Body." That these words do not mean,—not perceiving or acknowledging that the Bread is the Lord's Body,—is evident and undeniable on this ground, namely, that those who *do* suppose and acknowledge this, may still eat and drink unworthily. For the Apostle here clearly mentions the "not discerning the Lord's Body" as *characteristic* of those who eat and drink unworthily. And therefore whatever may be the meaning of the phrase, "discerning the Lord's Body," it cannot refer to anything which men who eat and drink unworthily may nevertheless do, and therefore not to recognizing the Bread as being, or as united with, the real Body of Christ. It is clearly spoken with reference to the feelings with which the elements are viewed, and is equally applicable, whether the Bread is considered as being the real Body of Christ, or united with it, or only the figure of it, and therefore proves nothing either way as to the point in question. It is clear, therefore, that the doctrine we are opposing can derive no support from the passage.

The real meaning of the words may, I think, be readily obtained from the context. The Apostle has been blaming the Corinthians for celebrating the Lord's Supper like a common meal, and he here admonishes them to come to it with due preparation, ("let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of

that bread and drink of that cup," v. 28), and warns them against eating and drinking unworthily, treating it only as an ordinary meal, and not distinguishing between bread eaten in such a way and bread set apart and consecrated as the symbol and sacrament of Christ's Body, which ought to be partaken of in the spirit of penitence and faith, and with a mind led up by the earthly symbol to that which it represents.

Another argument is raised from the words of St. Paul, 1 Cor. x. 1—22, by Archdeacon Denison,[1] which I must notice, but the very statement of it is almost sufficient for its refutation. The argument is this, that as there were to the Israelites "two types of Holy Baptism—the cloud and the sea," and "two types of Holy Communion—the Manna and the Rock," and *all* the Israelites partook of these types, "but nevertheless many of them perished miserably in the wilderness," so all Christians are partakers of the antitypes, even those who may perish everlastingly. Granted; but what then? The antitypes are, Baptism and the Lord's Supper, and all Christians are partakers of them. And the very passage that Archdeacon Denison puts prominently forward as particularly testifying in his favor might have led him to a different view; for when it is said of the smitten Rock of whose waters all the Israelites partook, "that Rock *was* Christ," we have an illustration of the meaning of the phrase that the consecrated Bread *is* Christ's Body. And as *all* the Israelites partook of the water from the Rock, but not of that which the water represented, so all nominal Christians may partake of the Eucharistic elements without partaking of that which they represent.

The argument is hardly worthy of serious refutation.

Before I pass on, however, I must not omit to point out the *direct* evidence afforded by the passages of Holy Scripture we have been considering *against* the doctrine in question.

First, then, it appears, that our Blessed Lord himself, after the consecration and distribution of the elements, spoke of the contents of the cup as "the fruit of the vine." (Matt. xxvi. 29. Mark xiv. 25.)

Against the doctrine of transubstantiation this is decisive.

[1] Serm. i. pp. 28 et seq.

There is no reasonable mode of evading the argument it affords. And as it respects the doctrine of consubstantiation, or the presence of Christ's blood in with or under the wine, the only attempt at a reply that can be made is, that though our Lord called it "this fruit of the vine" (*τούτου τοῦ γεννήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου*), it was in fact *his own blood together with the fruit of the vine*. I leave this reply in the hands of the reader, only observing how little it accords with the appeals made to us by Dr. Pusey and the Archdeacons to give to our Lord's words a literal interpretation.

Secondly, we must observe the language which St. Luke attributes to our Lord as to the cup. "This cup is the New Testament in my blood, which is shed for you." (*Τοῦτο τό ποτήριον, ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματι μου, τό ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυνόμενον.* Luke xxii. 20.) Here it is impossible not to admit the figurative nature of the words. Not only is the term "cup" used for that which is in it, but it is called the New Testament in the blood of Christ—words of a highly figurative character. And these words in St. Luke *correspond* to those in the other Evangelists, "This is my blood which is shed for many," which nevertheless we are told we must interpret, without any figure, as meaning, either that the wine was turned into the blood of Christ, or that his blood was joined to the wine.

Thirdly, St. Paul states as clearly as words can state that it is *bread* that is eaten; and that it is by eating the *bread* that we obtain communion with the body of Christ. "The *bread* which we *break*, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?" And "as often as ye *eat this bread*, &c., ye do show the Lord's death," &c. "Whosoever shall eat this *bread*, &c., unworthily," &c. "Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that *bread*," &c. Now if, as the Romanists say, it is after consecration no longer bread but the body of Christ, or if, as Archdeacon Denison and Dr. Pusey say, it is not *bread only*, but bread and the body of Christ forming together one compound whole, such language could not have been used by the Apostle. Under such circumstances, what we eat cannot be properly described as *bread*, for in one case there is no bread present, but only the body of Christ, and in the other it is bread and the body of Christ joined together, which would not have been described by

the Apostle as merely "bread," and could not be so described without a very harsh and unusual synecdoche; to which figure, however, Dr. Pusey and Archdeacon Denison are compelled to resort, in defiance of their own professions of abiding by the literal interpretation of the words.

Let us hear Bishop Jeremy Taylor's exposition of these words. He says:—

"The symbols of the blessed Sacrament are called *bread* and *the cup* after consecration; that is, in the whole use of them. This is twice affirmed by St. Paul, (1 Cor. x. 16.) 'The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communication (so it should be read) of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communication of the body of Christ?' as if he had said, 'This bread is Christ's body,' though there be also this mystery in it, 'This bread is the communication of Christ's body,' that is, the exhibition and donation of it, NOT CHRIST'S BODY FORMALLY, BUT VIRTUALLY AND EFFECTIVELY, *it makes us communicate with Christ's body in all the effects and benefits.* A like expression we have in Valerius Maximus, where Scipio, in the feast of Jupiter, is said *Graccho communicasse concordiam*, that is, *consignasse*, he *communicated concord;* he consigned it with the sacrifice giving him peace and friendship, the benefit of that communication; and so is the cup of benediction, that is, when the cup is blessed, it communicates Christ's blood, and so does the blessed bread; for 'to eat the bread, in the New Testament, is the sacrifice of Christians;' they are the words of S. Austin, (De civ. Dei, l. 17. c. 5,) *Omnes de uno pane participamus;* so S. Paul, 'we all partake of this one bread.' Hence the argument is plain; That which is broken is the communication of Christ's body; but that which is broken is bread; therefore bread is the communication of Christ's body. '*The bread which we break*,' those are the very words. The other place of S. Paul (1 Cor. xi. 28 & 26) is plainer yet, '*Let a man examine himself*,' &c.....Three times in this chapter he calls the eucharist, bread. It is bread, sacramental bread, when the communicant eats it."[1]

Fourthly, I must add, that the direction that we are to eat and drink the consecrated elements "in remembrance of" Christ, is hardly reconcileable with the notion that there is a real bodily presence of Christ, though unseen, in the elements. It can hardly be disputed, that the words are equivalent to saying,—When I am gone from you into heaven, then do as we

[1] Bp. J. Taylor's "The Real Presence," &c. ed. 1654. pp. 92, 93.

are now doing, in remembrance of me. But if a real bodily presence is vouchsafed, the words would hardly have been "in remembrance of me," but "in the consciousness of my body being as much present with you in the rite, though unseen, as it is now."

Our Lord's bodily absence is also clearly indicated by the phrase, that in the celebration of his Supper we are to show his death "till he come." The bread and wine represent his body *as dead*, the body broken and the blood shed, and we are thus to represent his death "till he come;" which words necessarily imply his bodily *absence*.

And further, the admonition that in this rite we are to exhibit *the Lord's death* till he come, leads us again to the remark that the bread and wine, as representing the *crucified* body and the *shed* blood, cannot have the actual presence of that body and blood united to them; for our Lord rose with a glorified body, a body numerically the same, but in condition very different, and therefore we cannot now have that body that was crucified and that blood that was shed actually and substantially with us. But it was *that* body and *that* blood that made the atonement, and it is of *that* body that we are to eat, and of *that* blood that we are to drink. And they are given to us by God that we may eat and drink them. It is therefore altogether a *spiritual* transaction, one in which our spirits only can take part. The eating and drinking are by that faith which is, as it were, the mouth of the soul. And the body broken and the blood shed 1800 years ago, are made present to our faith by God, and given to our souls that we may be nourished by them, for that "flesh is meat indeed, and that blood is drink indeed." And by thus partaking of the body broken and the blood shed upon the cross, we are brought to union and communion with that living, exalted, and glorified Saviour who now sitteth on the right hand of God.

And while He is thus eaten as *crucified* and *dead*, he is also present as *living* and *glorified*. For that glorified Saviour is present with us in the rite. His human nature is, in a spiritual sense, really present with us, though not bodily. As the sun, though bodily far away from us, is really present with us when we have the presence of his light and heat, so the human nature of Christ, though bodily far away from us, is enabled by that Spirit

to which it is united, to be present in power and influence throughout the earth, and thus to communicate to those who by a living faith are united to it, as the members of a body to the head, those spiritual energies and graces that dwell in it abundantly for communication to the members of His mystical body, the true Church.

If any man ask, what is the meaning of the phrase that the crucified body and the shed blood of our Blessed Lord are given to our souls for their nourishment; I would ask him again, whether the acts of faith have never obtained for him, when by faith eating and drinking that body and blood, nourishment and strength for the spiritual life of his soul, and whether this has not arisen from our Lord having set before him, as a host sets food before his guests, his own broken body and shed blood for his soul to feed upon?

And if it shall be further asked, whether, if this is the true doctrine, we cannot eat and drink the body and blood of Christ apart from the sacrament; our Lord himself has answered this question in the passage of Scripture which we are just about to consider, namely John vi. For he there discourses at large of eating his flesh and drinking his blood apart from the Eucharistic rite, as I trust will very clearly appear on a consideration of the passage. And not only does our Church in the rubric in the Service for the Visitation of the Sick maintain this to be the case, but it has even been admitted in the Church of Rome.

But the Sacramental rite has been instituted by our Blessed Lord for the special purpose both of calling forth these acts of the soul, and of making it a partaker of the blessing shadowed forth by it. That rite is, as it were, the preparation of a spiritual banquet for the soul of the believer, in which the crucified body and shed blood of his Saviour are given to him to feed upon, for the comfort and refreshment and strengthening of the spiritual life of his soul. And to help our weak faith, we are assisted by sensible objects, suited to impress us with some idea of the nature and character of the spiritual blessings derived to us thereby; but which, alas! some of Christ's ministers would fain boast, to their own glorification, that they turn into the things which they represent, so that *they* instead of *God* should be the dispensers of the heavenly gift.

Not only, therefore, is it in the Eucharistic rite that we are

more especially entitled to expect the presence of Christ communicating to our souls these inestimable blessings, but that rite, as instituted by our Blessed Lord with the admonition, "This do in remembrance of me," is one which it is our duty to observe, and in the neglect of which we have no right to expect the blessing which is peculiarly attached to its observance.

There is one more passage of Holy Scripture to which we are referred for proof that the true Body and Blood of Christ are so joined to the Bread and Wine, that to receive the one is to receive the other, namely, John vi. 50—58.

Now to understand our Lord's meaning in these words, we must consider the circumstances of the conversation in which they occurred. This conversation took place shortly after the miracle of the miraculous increase of the loaves and fishes. And when the multitude, delighted with this miraculous supply of their wants, wished to make our Lord a temporal king, and, on his withdrawal from them, followed him to another place, our Lord rebuked them in these words,—"Ye seek me, not "because ye saw the miracles [and estimated my true charac-"ter], but because ye did eat of the loaves, and were filled. "Labour not for the meat which perisheth, but for *that meat* "*which endureth unto everlasting life*, which the Son of Man "shall give unto you."[1] The Jews then asked him, what sign he had to show that he was what he professed to be, and could give meat that should endure unto everlasting life, and reminded him of the manna given through Moses in the wilderness. Our Lord replies, that a far greater miracle was exhibited to *them*, for God had given *them* "the true bread from heaven; for the bread of God is he which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life unto the world."[2] And when the Jews begged our Lord that he would give them that bread, our Lord replies in words *which show, in the most direct and express way, how that bread was to be eaten*,—"Jesus said unto them, I am the bread of life: *he that* COMETH TO ME *shall never hunger, and* HE THAT BELIEVETH ON ME *shall never thirst*."[3] THEY WERE TO EAT

[1] Verses 26, 27. [2] vv. 32, 33.

[3] v. 35. These words are not noticed by Archdeacon Wilberforce in his review of this chapter.

AND DRINK, THEREFORE, OF "THE BREAD OF LIFE," CHRIST, BY COMING TO AND BELIEVING ON HIM. The manna on which their fathers fed in the wilderness only sustained, and that for a time, the life of the corruptible body; but Christ incarnate brought to the believer in him food for the soul, because by believing in him the soul was nourished with food that ministered to it eternal life. "The Jews then murmured at him, because he said, I am the bread that came down from heaven;"[1] but our Lord, while he accounts for their not recognizing him in his true character,[2] repeats and amplifies what he had said before, observing,—

"Verily, verily, I say unto you, *He that believeth on me hath everlasting life* [*By believing on me, he has eaten of "the true bread from heaven," "the bread of life,"* for], I am that bread of life. Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness, and are dead. This is the bread which cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof and not die. [And *how* he is to eat thereof, v. 35 and 47 show.] I am the living bread which came down from heaven: if any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever; and the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world."

Our Lord here explains how his body was to become the bread of life to the world, namely, by his giving it as a sacrifice upon the cross.[3] It was upon his flesh as "given for the life of the world" that the faith of his followers was to feed.

"The Jews therefore strove among themselves, saying, How can this man give us his flesh to eat? Then Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day. For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed. He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him. As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father, so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me. This is that bread which came down

[1] Verse 41. [2] vv. 44, 45.

[3] Archdeacon Wilberforce refers here to Olshausen as pointing out that this clause, "if it is not a decided transition to another topic, is yet plainly an advance to some further point in the discourse." No doubt it is, because here our Lord proceeds to refer to his crucifixion, in which his flesh was given for the life of the world.

from heaven; not as your fathers did eat manna, and are dead; he that eateth of this bread shall live for ever."[1]

By reviewing this discourse, then, as a whole, we see plainly from our Lord's own words, what it is to eat him as the bread that came down from heaven, to eat his flesh and drink his blood; for when he calls himself "the bread of life," he immediately adds, "He that *cometh to me* shall never hunger, and he that *believeth on me* shall never thirst." And as in one place of this discourse he tells them, "Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life," so in another he says, as one inculcating the same truth, "He that believeth on me hath everlasting life."

That the language is in a measure figurative, all are constrained to allow; for our Lord here calls his body, bread; and this it could only be in a figurative sense. But if this is so, why are we, when he afterwards called bread his body, compelled to understand that phrase in another sense? And as to such a carnal eating and drinking of his body and blood as the Jews here seemed to suppose to be meant, that is repudiated by general consent.

And besides this explanation of his words in the former part of his discourse, our Lord adds afterwards privately to his disciples, who also stumbled at them, a further explanation,— "Doth this offend you? What and if ye shall see the Son of "Man ascend up where he was before? It is the spirit that "quickeneth: the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I "speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life. But there "are some of you that believe not."[2] Here again our Lord's words, whatever may be the precise meaning attached to them, clearly show, that in what he had been saying he had not been speaking of any oral eating and drinking of his flesh and blood. Leaving to others to give to these words the interpretation that they may consider to belong to them, I would suggest the following for their consideration:—Does this present a difficulty to you? Are you imagining that my words mean that you are literally to eat my flesh and drink my blood? How great then will be your difficulty when you see me leave this world and ascend to heaven, which will render it impossible for you thus

[1] Verses 47—58. [2] vv. 61—64.

to eat my flesh and drink my blood! But, understand their true meaning. The life of which I have been speaking is the result of the influences of the Spirit; my flesh, were you to eat it in the way you are thinking of, would profit you nothing; the words that I speak unto you, they are the instruments for imparting spiritual life to your souls, for "he that believeth my words hath everlasting life." But there are some of you that believe not my words, and therefore know not what that life is.

And in another address to the Jews, delivered shortly after this conversation occurred, our Lord repeats very similar language, exclaiming publicly in the temple, "If any man thirst, let "him come unto me *and drink*. He that *believeth on me*, as the "Scripture hath said, Out of his belly shall flow rivers of living "water. But this [adds the Evangelist] spake he of the Spirit, "which they that *believe on him* should receive."[1]

When therefore the words referred to are taken with their context, it is difficult to understand how any one can interpret them of any literal or oral eating and drinking of Christ's body and blood, whether in the Eucharist or any other way, and whether that body and blood are supposed to be present in a material or immaterial form.

It has been asked,—If the Jews misunderstood our Lord, when they said, "How can this man give us his flesh to eat?" why did not our Lord correct their mistake, instead of repeating what he had said? It might as well be asked, Why did not our Lord come down from the cross, when the Jews promised to believe in him if he did? The very question shows a want of knowledge of the nature of our Lord's teaching, for throughout his whole ministry he spoke to the multitude, as he himself tells us, "in parables." And when he was alone he explained things further to his disciples, so far as they were able to bear it.[2] And this he did, to some extent, in the case before us; though of course not satisfactorily to those who did not believe in him.

But that the words were not spoken with any reference to eating and drinking the Body and Blood of Christ in any other way than figuratively, through the exercise of faith in him, is evident from the fact that there was then no rite in which any-

[1] John vii. 37—39. [2] Matt. xiii. 34; Mark iv. 34.

thing of the kind could take place. For the Eucharistic rite had not then been ordained, and *the words speak of the time then present.* "I am the bread of life: he that *cometh* to me shall never hunger, and he that *believeth* on me shall never thirst"—"He that believeth on me HATH everlasting life"—"Whoso *eateth* my flesh . . . HATH eternal life"—&c. They had not to stop till the institution of the Eucharist to feed on Christ. They were called upon to do so *at that time.* If our Lord had been speaking of the Eucharist, he would have said, "Whoso *shall* eat my flesh, &c., *shall have* everlasting life."

The reply made by Archdeacon Wilberforce to this argument is utterly and obviously untenable. He is driven to the position that the words are "a *prophetic* statement" respecting a truth subsequently to be fulfilled,[1] "a *prophetical* allusion to the Holy Eucharist."[2] But the words themselves completely negative this notion. They clearly apply to the time at which they were spoken. There is not the shadow of an excuse for calling them *prophetical.* And it is by an examination of the words themselves, that we must judge whether there is any foundation for this argument. But instead of judging in this way, the Archdeacon, either led away by that habit of loose argumentation from insufficient premises to which he seems to have addicted himself—in consequence, I suppose, of "the necessities of his position" as Minister of a Church to whose doctrine he is opposed,—or from some other cause, draws his arguments from considerations totally irrelevant to the point in question. He thinks it "singular" that the objection should be raised "by parties who allow our Lord's absolute foreknowledge," and declares that it "proceeds on an entire forgetfulness of the peculiar character and purpose of St. John's Gospel,"[3] and he then runs off into a long disquisition as to the objects of St. John's Gospel. Such irrelevant and illogical argumentation is its own answer. He might as well have argued that our Lord's words to the woman of Samaria were "prophetical," and defended it on the ground of our Lord's foreknowledge, and the character and purpose of St. John's Gospel. Our Lord's meaning must be judged by the words themselves.

The argument[4] that the third chapter of St. John is in like

[1] p. 189. p. 213. [3] pp. 181, 182. [4] pp. 185, 186.

manner prophetical of Christian Baptism, is clearly a mistake, because our Lord's disciples *did* practise baptism at that time; and it is evident that our Lord was here uttering no prophecy of a thing that was future, for he rebukes Nicodemus with the words, "Art thou a master of Israel and knowest not these things?"

The greatest violence, therefore, must be done both to the words and the sense of the passage, to make it relate directly and properly to the reception of the Eucharistic elements.

But further; not only does this passage give no support to the doctrine of Dr. Pusey and the Archdeacons, but in more than one respect it is directly opposed to it. For,

First, It is the best explanation we can have of the meaning of the expression, eating the flesh of Christ and drinking his blood, and therefore of the nature of those acts to which we are called in the Lord's Supper, showing that the outward eating and drinking are only representations of, and as it were incentives to, spiritual acts, that is, an eating and drinking by the soul, through faith, of the body and blood of Christ, as given upon the cross for the life of the world. For it can hardly be argued, that we eat the flesh of Christ and drink his blood in the Eucharist in a different way from that which is here spoken of. The acts of the soul here referred to are the same under all circumstances. But in the Eucharistic rite, which was specially ordained by Christ for this purpose, and has certain outward symbols to the faithful use of which the blessing of such a participation of the body and blood of Christ is promised, these acts of the soul are performed under far more favorable circumstances than they can otherwise be.

And hence we may observe, that this passage of St. John's Gospel, though not spoken by our Lord with direct reference to the Eucharist, yet, as relating to the spiritual acts to which we are called in that rite, is applicable to it, and affords the best explanation of the nature of the acts to which we are called in it.

Secondly, it directly negatives the doctrine that the wicked can eat the flesh and drink the blood of Christ, in whatever sense the words may be taken, because we have the express statement, "Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal

life. . . . He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood dwelleth in me, and I in him."

And the explanation offered by Archdeacon Denison[1] is one of the most arbitrary kind, founded upon the *assumption* that the words do not refer to an act of faith, and also contrary to their plain meaning. For he makes the blessing here promised dependent—not upon eating and drinking our Lord's flesh and blood, *according to our Lord's own words*—but upon eating and drinking them *with faith*; and this because our Lord says, "He that believeth on me hath everlasting life;" *assuming* that this eating and drinking does not refer, *in itself*, to an act of faith, though the context clearly shows that it does; and a similar explanation is given by Archdeacon Wilberforce.[2] So that here also our Lord's words must be *altered*, before they can be made to bear the sense put upon them by the two Archdeacons. Our Lord says, that he that eats and drinks His body and blood, hath eternal life; and the context shows that he means by this eating and drinking, an act of faith. The Archdeacons, wishing to oppose the doctrine that this eating and drinking is *itself* an act of faith, make our Lord say, that he who eats and drinks his body and blood *with faith* hath eternal life; which involves the inference that a man may eat and drink them *without faith*. I hope we may be permitted to prefer our Lord's own testimony.

It is, as usual, an arrow from Bellarmine's quiver, and it is thus dealt with in a passage which I shall quote at large from Bishop Jeremy Taylor, both as showing his answer to the cavil, and also his general view of the passage:—

"Concerning 'the bread' or the 'meat indeed' of which Christ speaks, he also affirms that 'whosoever eats it hath life abiding in him.' But this is not true of the Sacrament, for the wicked eating it receive to themselves damnation. It cannot, therefore, be understood of oral manducation, but of spiritual, and of eating Christ by faith: that is, receiving him by any instrument or action evangelical. For receiving Christ by faith includes any way of communicating with his body; by baptism, by holy desires, by obedience, by love, by worthy receiving of the Holy Sacrament. And it signifies no otherwise but as if Christ had said; 'To all that believe in me and obey, I will become the author of life and salvation.' Now, because this is not done by all that receive the Sacrament, not by unworthy communicants, who yet

[1] pp. 38, 39. [2] pp. 221—4.

eat the symbols (according to us), and eat Christ's body (according to their doctrine), it is unanswerably certain, that Christ here spake of *Spiritual manducation*, not of *Sacramental*. Bellarmine (he that answers all things whether he can or no) says, that words of this nature are conditional; meaning, that he who eats Christ's flesh *worthily* shall live for ever; and therefore this effects nothing upon vicious persons, yet it may be meant of the Sacrament, because without his *proper condition* it is not prevalent. I reply, that it is true it is not, it cannot; and that this condition is *spiritual manducation;* but then *without this condition the man* DOTH NOT EAT CHRIST'S FLESH, that which himself calls the true bread, for he that eats this, ἔχει, he *hath* life in him, that is, he is united to me, he is in the state of grace at present. For it ought to be observed, that although promises *de futuro possibili* are to be understood with a condition appendant; yet propositions affirmative at present, are declarations of a thing in being, and suppose it actually existent: and the different parts of this observation are observable in the several parts of the 54th verse, 'He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life:' that is an affirmation of a thing in being, and therefore implies no other condition but the connexion of the predicate with the subject. 'He that eats hath life'.....The argument is no other than what I learned from S. Austin, *Hujus rei sacramentum, &c., de mensa Dominica sumitur quibusdam ad vitam, quibusdam ad exitium; res vero ipsa cujus Sacramentum est, omni homini ad vitam, nulli ad exitium, quicunque ejus particeps fuerit.* (Tract. 26. in Johan.) And it is remarkable that the context and design of this place takes off this evasion from the adversary. For here Christ opposes this eating of his flesh to the Israelites eating of Manna, and prefers it infinitely; because they who did eat Manna might die, viz., spiritually and eternally; but they that eat his flesh shall never die, meaning, they shall not die eternally; and therefore THIS EATING CANNOT BE A THING WHICH CAN POSSIBLY BE DONE UNWORTHILY. For if Manna, as it was sacramental, had been eaten worthily, they had not died who eat it; and what privilege then is in this above Manna, save only that the eating of this, supposes the man to do it worthily, and to be a worthy person, which the other did not? Upon which consideration, *Caietan* (In Joh. 6.) says, that this eating is not common to worthily and unworthily, and that it is not spoken of eating the sacrament, but of eating and drinking (that is, communicating with) the death of Jesus. The argument, therefore, lies thus. There is something which Christ hath promised us, which whosoever receives, he receives life and not death; but this is not the sacrament: for of them that communicate, some receive to life, and some to death, saith S. Austin, and a greater than S. Austin,

St. Paul (1 Cor. xi.); and yet this which is life to all that receive it, is Christ's flesh (said Christ himself); therefore *Christ's flesh* here spoken of is not *sacramental*." [1]

Thirdly, it directly refutes another notion maintained by the authors under review; namely, that the Body and Blood of Christ may be received without producing any salutary effect upon the person receiving it. For the declaration it contains is perfectly general, as has been remarked in the extract just given from Bp. Taylor. He who thus eats and drinks *has* eternal life. The latter is a consequence of the former; and faith is necessary to enable a man thus to eat and drink.

Fourthly, Our Lord here expressly says, that the flesh profiteth nothing, with an evident reference to those who, instead of giving a spiritual sense to his words, and understanding them to mean the spiritual acts of faith, imagined them to refer to an actual eating of his flesh. Nor is it any sufficient reply to this to say, that our Lord was only rebuking the Capernaite notion of eating his flesh in a *material* form, but did not refer to an eating of his flesh present in a supernatural way, after the manner of existence of a spirit. For our Lord does not contrast these two modes of orally eating his flesh, (as indeed he was not likely to do, the latter being a self-contradiction in terms) but he contrasts the carnal notion of an oral manducation of his flesh with those spiritual acts to which his words referred. It has been said, Can these words be supposed to mean that Christ's flesh is of no profit to the eater of it when he himself says, "My flesh is meat indeed?" Certainly not, if the words are understood in the right sense, as indicating that spiritual act to which our Blessed Lord referred when he used the latter words. But as certainly is it so, if the words are taken to mean an oral eating of that flesh. And to this *effect* speaks Chrysostom, in words which have been perverted by Archdeacon Wilberforce[2] for the support of his error, in manifest opposition to their author's meaning. On the words, "It is the spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing," he says,—"That is, the things spoken concerning me are to be "understood spiritually; for he who hears them with carnal "notions gains nothing and is no way benefited." And having

[1] Bp. J. Taylor, The Real Presence, &c. ed. 1654. pp. 42—45. [2] p. 206.

noticed that the question, "How can this man give us his flesh to eat?" arose from understanding carnally what was to be understood spiritually, and that the phrase *eating his flesh* was to be understood not in a carnal, but in a spiritual sense, he adds, on the words, "the flesh profiteth nothing,"—

"He does not say this of his own flesh; God forbid; but of those who understand what is said in a carnal sense. But what is it to understand these things carnally? To look simply at the surface of the words, and not to carry our thoughts to anything beyond it. For this is to view things carnally. But we ought not thus to judge by the outsides of things, but to contemplate all mysteries with the eyes of our mind. For this is to see things spiritually. Is it not the case that he who does not eat his flesh and drink his blood has not life in him? How then does that flesh profit nothing without which it is impossible to live? You see that the words, 'the flesh profiteth nothing,' are not spoken concerning his flesh, but concerning a carnal understanding of his words."[1]

Precisely so. Our Lord does not mean that his flesh is of no value to us, because by it we have been redeemed, and without partaking of that flesh, in the spiritual sense of the words, we could have no spiritual life. But he guards his hearers against the carnal notions attached to his words by the Capernaites, who looked at the mere surface of the words, (the literal sense, as our authors would call it,) and supposed that he spoke of an oral manducation of his flesh.

And the difference between the notion of the Romanists, with the authors under review, and that of the Capernaites, is in fact a nullity when it comes to be examined, and the balance of good sense is in favor of the Capernaites. For if the flesh of Christ is to be eaten by the mouth at all, it is much more reasonable to suppose that it should be eaten in a material form than in an immaterial. And the notion of eating it in an

[1] Πνευματικῶς δεῖ τὰ περὶ ἐμοῦ ἀκούειν. Ὁ γὰρ σαρκικῶς ἀκούσας οὐδὲν ἀπώνατο, κ. τ. λ. . . . . Οὐ περὶ τῆς ἑαυτοῦ σαρκὸς λέγων· μὴ γένοιτο· ἀλλὰ περὶ τῶν σαρκικῶς ἐκλαμβανόντων τὰ λεγόμενα. Τί δέ ἐστι τὸ σαρκικῶς νοῆσαι; τὸ ἁπλῶς εἰς τὰ προκείμενα ὁρᾶν, καὶ μὴ πλέον τι φαντάζεσθαι. Τοῦτο γάρ ἐστι σαρκικῶς. Χρὴ δὲ μὴ οὕτω κρίνειν τοῖς ὁρωμένοις, ἀλλὰ πάντα τὰ μυστήρια τοῖς ἔνδον ὀφθαλμοῖς κατοπτεύειν· τοῦτο γάρ ἐστι πνευματικῶς· ἆρα ὁ μὴ τρώγων αὐτοῦ τὴν σάρκα, καὶ πίνων αὐτοῦ τὸ αἷμα, οὐκ ἔχει ζωὴν ἐν ἑαυτῷ; Πῶς οὖν οὐδὲν ὠφελεῖ ἡ σὰρξ, ἧς ἄνευ ζῆν οὐκ ἔνι; Ὁρᾷς ὅτι τὸ, ἡ σὰρξ οὐκ ὠφελεῖ οὐδὲν, οὐ περὶ τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ εἴρηται, ἀλλὰ περὶ τῆς σαρκικῆς ἀκροάσεως. Chrysost. In Johann. hom. 47. § 2. Op. ed. Bened. Paris. tom. 8, pp. 277, 8.

immaterial form is a mere groundless imagination, devised for the purpose of asserting a bodily presence, and yet escaping the difficulties to which the notion of such a presence is obnoxious.

And after all, Archdeacon Wilberforce, though he maintains that the flesh of Christ is to be orally eaten, and that it is life-giving when thus eaten, through its union with the Godhead,[1] finds himself compelled to confess, as we have seen, not only, that when eaten by the wicked it produces no good effect, but that even when eaten by the faithful, the salutary effect is produced not by its being received into the mouth, but only through the acts of faith, and that any effect it may have upon the body is only through the soul. And it is undeniable that faith can feed upon it as well supposing it to be in heaven as if it were in the stomach. And it is as much present to faith in the one case as in the other. So that though he vehemently opposes the notion that the words of our Lord can mean that his flesh orally eaten would profit nothing, because he sees that it would be repugnant to his notion that that flesh is to be thus eaten, he is compelled to confess what is tantamount to it.

But the interpretation given to these words by the authors under review is, as usual, defended on the ground that this is the meaning attributed to them by the Fathers. Thus, Archdeacon Denison quotes this as one of those "passages of Holy "Writ, witnessed to by the Church Catholic as declaring the "fact of the Real Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in "the consecrated elements of the Holy Eucharist."[2] And the following is Archdeacon Wilberforce's very characteristic appeal to the reader as to the method of interpretation that must be adopted in order to ascertain the meaning of this passage. He says,—

"It is plain that the question must be decided by two considerations [meaning, I suppose, *one of the two*]—either by the natural force of the words, as understood by any one, or by *the sense put upon them by the Church*. The first will be to appeal to *each man's private judgment;* the second, either to listen to *the Church as an authorized teacher*, or to admit that at all events the stream was likely to be clearest when it was near its source."[3]

And then, according to the custom of his party, having quoted a few Fathers, he calls upon us to accept the meaning which,

[1] p. 215. [2] Serm. i. p. 26. [3] p. 187.

*in the exercise of his private judgment* upon the statements of these Fathers, he considers them to have put upon those words of Holy Scripture as "the sense put upon them *by the Church*," and thus "to listen to *the Church* as an authorized teacher." It is truly marvellous how educated men can so delude themselves. A dozen Fathers, whose writings have come to us almost wholly through unscrupulous Romanists, and almost all of them further removed from the Apostles than we are from the Reformers, are to be taken as the sure witnesses of the doctrine of the millions that composed *the Church of Christ!* And while the Archdeacon thus attacks the right of private judgment, nevertheless both here and throughout his whole work, his doctrine is founded upon an exercise of *his own private judgment*, in opposition to, not merely the greatest of the divines of his own Church, but even against the Formularies to the reception and belief of which he is solemnly pledged. Can the Archdeacon be ignorant that the whole of the ground he has here traversed has been repeatedly gone over by many of our greatest divines, particularly Bishop Jewel, long ago, men with whose knowledge of the Fathers that of hardly any theologian of the present day deserves to be compared, and that their inferences from the writings of the Fathers are opposed to his? Whichever then may be right, his pretence of discarding the right of private judgment, and being governed by the decision of "the Church," as if a few Fathers represented the Church, or as if those Fathers had spoken so that all must agree as to what their view was, is on the face of it preposterous. The truth is, none have exercised the right of private judgment to so great an extent as the Tractarians—to an extent, in fact, which is justly offensive to all who have any regard for the sacredness of the obligation which binds the ministers of our Church to the reception of its Formularies; for their own private inferences from passages in the writings of the Fathers, have been set up by them as the decisions of "the Church," in opposition to the very Formularies by subscription to which they hold their position in our Church.

And now let us examine the truth of the Archdeacon's statement, that all the Fathers held this passage of Holy Scripture to have been spoken by our Lord of the Eucharist, and we shall find that it is utterly unfounded. It is essential for the main-

tenance of the Archdeacon's system that such should be the case, for if these words of our Lord as to eating his flesh and drinking his blood refer to a spiritual act, which may be done apart from the Eucharist as well as in connexion with it, then it is clear that to eat his flesh and drink his blood is a very different thing from eating and drinking the consecrated bread and wine; while according to the Archdeacon's system they are identical, and we cannot eat and drink his body and blood but by eating and drinking the consecrated Eucharistic elements. For he tells us that his system "supposes all blessings to be embodied in the "Humanity of the Word, and from Him to be extended to his "members;" and that "to partake of his sacred flesh is the method "by which men enter into relation with him, just as by birth "men partake of that old nature which has been transmitted to "us by Adam;" and that this doctrine "lies at the root of the whole Christian system."[1] What the Archdeacon maintains, therefore, is, that these words refer, in their proper sense, *exclusively* to the eating and drinking the consecrated elements in the Eucharist. And from this he deduces the inference that the consecrated Eucharistic elements, to answer their purpose, must be the real body and blood of Christ.

Now, *first*, several of the Fathers expressly interpret these words as referring to a spiritual act, independent of the Eucharist, and do not apply them at all to the Eucharist; and, *secondly*, others who sometimes speak of them in connexion with the Eucharist, in other places apply them to a spiritual act independent of the Eucharist. All these writers, therefore, are entirely opposed to the notion of the Archdeacons. And the application of the words made by the latter is a very obvious and just one, because since our Lord's establishment of the Eucharistic rite, it is in that rite more especially that the spiritual act here referred to takes place. The soul feeds on the flesh and blood of Christ more especially in the rite in which the symbols of that flesh and blood are partaken of.

The question, be it observed, with respect to John vi., is, not whether the words are *applicable* to what takes place in the Eucharistic rite in the case of *the faithful* communicant. It is not doubted by any one that such is the case. The Eucharist

[1] p. 198.

being the specially appointed ordinance in which the feeding of the believer on Christ is both outwardly represented and inwardly exercised, and the spiritual food is inwardly given to every faithful communicant; these words of our Lord might well be referred to by ecclesiastical writers as showing the blessings flowing from a participation of the Eucharist, not because they originally referred to the Eucharist, but because those spiritual acts to which they referred were what the Eucharist was instituted to promote. And this we find to have been done by many of the Fathers. And in such a case, none who know the loose way in which passages of Scripture are sometimes cited by some of the Fathers as referring to matters with which no one in the present day would connect them, could feel at all surprised even if they were occasionally alluded to by them as if they had been spoken expressly of the Eucharist.

But the question is, whether the words were spoken *formally* and *directly* of eating and drinking the bread and wine in the Eucharist. What the authors under review maintain is, that the communion with our Lord there spoken of takes place *only* (except under extraordinary circumstances not affecting the general question) in the Eucharistic rite; while we maintain, that it takes place not only in that rite, but independently of it, and therefore does not arise from the oral reception of the bread and wine. And on this point I undertake to show, notwithstanding the self-confident statements of the Archdeacons, that we have the best Patristical authority in our favor, even among those Fathers who have been quoted as opposed to us.

And before I proceed to the passages to which I am about to refer, I would at once reply to the remarks by which Archdeacon Wilberforce tries to neutralize the force of them. He would fain persuade us, that when the antient writers speak of the Body and Blood of Christ in connexion with any spiritual communion with him apart from the reception of the Eucharist, they are speaking of a benefit bestowed through "extraordinary channels," and to meet such expressions it is admitted, as of course it could not be denied, that "virtue issues from our Lord as the fountain of grace in any manner which pleases him;" and the astounding hypothesis is put forward, that "when the Body and

"Blood of Christ are spoken of, as imparted to those who in this "extraordinary manner are brought into relation to Christ, it is "not because Flesh and Blood are employed as metaphorical "terms for expressing grace or doctrines, [in which I agree with "him,] but *because the Holy Eucharist, being the sacrament of "Christ's Flesh and Blood, suggests the order in which other gifts "are communicated.*" [1]

It would be useless to comment on such a hypothesis, and there needs no other reply than that the supposition that these writers are speaking of anything out of the ordinary course of things is *entirely groundless*, and contrary to the language they use. When they interpret these words as referring to a spiritual act of the mind, they give that interpretation as the proper interpretation of the words; and in so doing, even though they may elsewhere apply the words to the Eucharistic rite, they negative the Archdeacon's interpretation of them.

This distinction between interpreting the words as spoken *expressly* of the Eucharist, and using them as *applicable* to what takes place in the Eucharistic rite, is so well put by Waterland, that I shall here transcribe some of his remarks on the point. He says:—

"They who judge that the Fathers in general, or almost universally, do interpret John vi. of the Eucharist, appear not to distinguish between *interpreting* and *applying*: it was right to *apply* the *general* doctrine of John vi. to the particular case of the Eucharist, considered as *worthily* received; because the *spiritual feeding* there mentioned is the *thing signified* in the Eucharist, yea, and *performed* likewise. After we have sufficiently proved, from other Scriptures, that in and by the Eucharist, ordinarily, such *spiritual food* is conveyed, it is then right to *apply* all that our Lord, by St. John, says in the *general*, to that *particular* case: and this indeed the Fathers commonly did. But such *application* does not amount to *interpreting* that chapter of the Eucharist. For example; the words, 'except ye eat the flesh of Christ, &c., you have no life in you,' do not mean directly, that *you have no life without the Eucharist*, but that you have no life *without participating of our Lord's passion*. Nevertheless since the Eucharist is one way of *participating of the passion*, and a very considerable one, it was very pertinent and proper to urge the doctrine of that chapter, both for the clearer understanding the *beneficial* nature of the Eucharist, and for the exciting

[1] pp. 200, 201.

Christians to a frequent and devout reception of it. Such was the use which some early Fathers made of John vi. (as our Church also does at this day, and that very justly,) though I will not say that some of the later Fathers did not extend it further." [1]

To these remarks Archdeacon Wilberforce thinks himself justified in giving the following answer:—

"It has been shown that the sixth chapter of St. John consists of two parts—first, we have a general statement of our Lord's Mediation, v. 30—50, and then a declaration that the Holy Eucharist is the medium through which its benefits are communicated, v. 51—58. But Waterland's theory makes no account of the latter set of expressions .....Waterland gives no reason why the ancient writers should have considered these words to be so plainly relevant to the Holy Eucharist, that they almost invariably quote them in this relation. How came they thus to employ them, unless they supposed that this was the natural force of the words: or how could they venture to give this meaning to our Lord's words, unless such had been their received interpretation?" [2]

Now to what cause we are to attribute such a mode of arguing on the subject, I will not pretend to say. Whether it is from real confusion of mind, or some other cause, I leave to the reader to determine. But certainly such argumentation can do no harm but to its author. For in the first place, he assumes the very point in question, namely, that vv. 51—58 do refer expressly to the Eucharist, and then finds fault with Waterland's theory because it maintains the contrary; and in fact some of Waterland's quotations from the Fathers relate to the very passage in question; and secondly, he tells us that Waterland gives no reason why the Fathers considered these words to be "relevant to the Holy Eucharist," in the face of Waterland's elaborate statement of the grounds on which *all* should consider that these words *are* relevant to the Holy Eucharist.

And I must remind him, that some of the Fathers use passages occurring in that part of the chapter which he himself considers to refer only to our Lord's mediation as applicable to what takes place in the Eucharist, as freely as they do passages in the latter part; and, therefore, if their application in this way of the latter part proves that it refers expressly and formally to the Eucharist,

[1] Waterland's Review of Doctrine of Eucharist, ch. 6. Works ed. Oxf. 1843. vol. 4. p. 543.

[2] p. 204.

their similar application of the former proves the same thing with respect to the former part; which nevertheless the Archdeacon is not prepared to grant.

But I proceed to the Fathers themselves, and I shall take them in the order in which they are referred to by the Archdeacon.

In the references the Archdeacon gives to St. Ignatius and St. Irenæus,[1] this passage of Holy Scripture is neither cited, nor in any way alluded to, and therefore I shall not detain the reader to discuss them.

"As we advance further," adds the Archdeacon, "we find hardly a single writer of consequence, by whom this chapter is not connected with the Holy Eucharist." And he then commences his list with two authors who are clearly *opposed* to him.

The first is Tertullian, of whom he says, "It is so by Ter-
"tullian, who establishes the relation of 'our daily bread' with
"this sacrament, by referring to our Lord's words, 'I am the
"bread of life.' (De orat. 6.)"

Now it is surprising that the Archdeacon should so soon have forgotten what he had himself said only a few pages before,[2] that "from the 30th to the 50th verse our Lord had declared nothing but the general truth, that he was the Mediator, through whom all divine gifts were bestowed upon men," and that the part relating to the Sacrament does not commence till v. 51, and that the controversy is respecting vv. 51—58. For the verse quoted by Tertullian is the 46th, and therefore the citation is most unfortunate. Nor does Tertullian refer to the Eucharist in the words here cited, but only generally to Christ as the giver of life. His words are, that "we ought rather to
"understand 'Give us this day our daily bread' spiritually;
"for Christ is our bread; because Christ is life, and bread is
"life. 'I am,' he says, 'the bread of life.' And a little before,
"'The bread is the Word of the living God, who came down
"from heaven.'" That is, he would have us, when using this petition of the Lord's Prayer, pray more especially that we may be made partakers of the heavenly bread, Christ. But here is no reference to the Eucharistic bread. And in fact, to use this

[1] pp. 196—8. [2] p. 189.

prayer as if it so referred, would be a mockery; for we do not pray to God to give us the Eucharistic bread, but we go to man for it; and the Archdeacon will tell us, that if we receive it from the hands of a properly ordained priest, we are sure to receive and eat with it the real body of Christ, the heavenly bread.

True, in the words following, Tertullian gives *another* reason why our Lord was called bread, and then he refers to the bread of the Eucharist, but that will not help the Archdeacon.

But there is another passage of Tertullian in which he *does* refer to that very part of this chapter, (John vi.) the meaning of which is in controversy; and he there entirely overthrows the Archdeacon's interpretation of it; for he says,—

"Thus, although he says the flesh profits nothing, the meaning is to be guided by the subject matter. For because they thought his discourse hard and intolerable, as if he had decreed that his flesh was to be truly eaten by them, that he might refer the state of salvation to the influences of the Spirit, he premised, that 'it is the Spirit that quickeneth,' and then added, 'The flesh profits nothing,' that is, to give life. And he goes on to say what he wishes to be understood by 'the Spirit,'—'The words which I have spoken to you, they are spirit, and they are life:' as also before, 'He that heareth my words and believeth in Him that sent me, hath eternal life, and shall not come into condemnation, but shall pass from death unto life.' Therefore constituting His word the quickener, because his word is spirit and life, he also called the same his flesh: because also the Word was made flesh; and moreover is to be desired for the purpose of life, both to be devoured by hearing, and to be ruminated upon by the mind, and to be digested by faith."[1]

So much for the support given by Tertullian to the Archdeacon.

[1] Sic etsi carnem ait nihil prodesse, ex materia dicti dirigendus est sensus. Nam quia durum et intolerabilem existimaverunt sermonem ejus, quasi vere carnem suam illis edendam determinasset, ut in spiritum disponeret statum salutis, præmisit, "Spiritus est qui vivificat," atque ita subjunxit, "Caro nihil prodest," ad vivificandum scilicet. Exequitur etiam quid velit intelligi spiritum, "Verba quæ locutus sum vobis, spiritus sunt, vita sunt:" sicut et supra, "Qui audit sermones meos, et credit in eum qui me misit, habet vitam æternam, et in judicium non veniet, sed transiet de morte ad vitam." Itaque sermonem constituens vivificatorem, quia spiritus et vita sermo, eumdem etiam carnem suam dixit: quia et sermo caro erat factus; proinde in causam vitæ appetendus, et devorandus auditu, et ruminandus intellectu, et fide digerendus. TERTULL. de resurr. carnis, c. 37. Op. ed. Paris. 1664, p. 347.

He is equally unfortunate in his next reference, which is to Clement of Alexandria. He says,—"St. Clement of Alexandria quotes some of our Lord's memorable expressions as introductory to a mention of the Holy Eucharist. 'The Lord provides for us food from himself. He offers flesh and pours forth blood, and nothing is wanting to the children's growth.'" [1]

Now so far from Clement quoting the words "as introductory to a mention of the Holy Eucharist," he makes no mention at all of the Eucharist, and, in the passage from which the Archdeacon's quotation is taken, *expressly expounds our Lord's words of eating his flesh and drinking his blood as spoken in a symbolical and allegorical sense.* So that the Archdeacon cannot have the slightest acquaintance with the original passage from which he has given these few words, taken I suppose from some quotation he has seen elsewhere.

Clement, after having compared Christ, the Word, to milk, proceeds thus,—"But elsewhere also the Lord, in the Gospel according to St. John, has expounded this in another manner, *through symbols*, saying, 'Eat my flesh and drink my blood;' making drink an evident symbol of faith and the promise, through which the Church, like a man, consisting of many members, is watered and increased." [2] And then, having proceeded to notice the use of blood to the animal system, he makes the remark, alluded to by the Archdeacon, in these words,—"The Word is everything to the infant, both father and mother and tutor and nurse. 'Eat my flesh,' he says, 'and drink my blood.' The Lord supplies us with these suitable nourishments, and stretches out his flesh and pours forth his blood, and nothing is wanting for the growth of his children." [3] But not a word is here about the Eucharist, and from the explanation

[1] p. 199.

[2] Ἀλλαχόθι δὲ καὶ ὁ Κύριος ἐν τῷ κατὰ Ἰωάννην Εὐαγγελίῳ ἑτέρως ἐξήνεγκεν διὰ συμβολων· Φάγεσθέ μου τὰς σάρκας, εἰπὼν, καὶ πίεσθέ μου τὸ αἷμα· ἐναργὲς τῆς πίστεως καὶ τῆς ἐπαγγελίας τὸ πότιμον ἀλληγορῶν, δι' ὧν ἡ Ἐκκλησία, καθάπερ ἄνθρωπος, ἐκ πολλῶν συνεστηκυῖα μελῶν, ἄρδεταί τε καὶ αὔξεται. CLEM. ALEX. Pædag. lib. i. Op. ed. Potter. tom. i. p. 121.

[3] Ὁ Λόγος τὰ πάντα τῷ νηπίῳ, καὶ πατὴρ, καὶ μήτηρ, καὶ παιδαγωγὸς, καὶ τροφεύς. Φάγεσθέ μου, φησὶ, τὴν σάρκα, καὶ πίεσθέ μου τὸ αἷμα. Ταύτας ἡμῖν οἰκείας τροφὰς ὁ Κύριος χορηγεῖ, καὶ σάρκα ὀρέγει, καὶ αἷμα ἐκχεῖ· καὶ οὐδὲν εἰς αὔξησιν τοῖς παιδίοις ἐνδεῖ. ID. ib. p. 123.

which had been given but just before of the words of St. John, it is clear that no reference is even implied. The words "stretching out his flesh and pouring forth his blood" clearly refer to his sacrifice of himself on the cross. Nay more, he follows it up with other remarks which still further manifest his meaning; for after some further remarks on Christ as our food, he adds,— "Thus the Word is allegorically described in various ways, both "as food, and flesh, and nourishment, and bread, and blood, "and milk. The Lord is everything, to minister to the enjoy- "ment of us who believe in him."[1] And then he proceeds to say that his blood is allegorically called wine, referring for proof to Gen. xlix. 11. "Washing his robe in wine, and his garment in the blood of the grape," still without any reference to the Eucharist; and finally adds that blood as well as milk is "a symbol of the passion and doctrine of our Lord."[2]

So that his explanation of the words in question in John vi. is *precisely the contrary* to that which it is represented to be by the Archdeacon; and so elsewhere he says, that "the flesh and "blood of the Word are the comprehension of the Divine power "and essence. Taste and see that the Lord is Christ, he says; "for thus he bestows himself upon those who partake of such "food spiritually."[3] And again,—"the eating and drinking of "the Divine Word is the knowledge of the Divine essence."[4]

Such are two out of the five Patristical authorities quoted by the Archdeacon as proofs that vv. 51—58 of John vi. were spoken by our Lord of the Eucharist, and which he calls "decisive statements" in his favor!

His next reference is to Cyprian, who, he tells us, "founds "his remarks on the Holy Eucharist upon the fact that our "Lord himself preached and warned, 'I am the bread of life "which came down from heaven.'"[5] The words, "founds his "remarks on the Holy Eucharist upon," &c., show that Archdeacon Wilberforce is not speaking from any acquaintance with the work itself he here quotes, for the passage to which he here

[1] Οὕτως πολλαχῶς ἀλληγορεῖται ὁ Λόγος, καὶ βρῶμα, καὶ σὰρξ, καὶ τροφὴ, καὶ ἄρτος, καὶ αἷμα, καὶ γάλα· ἅπαντα ὁ Κύριος, εἰς ἀπόλαυσιν ἡμῶν τῶν εἰς αὐτὸν πεπιστευκότων. Id. ib. p. 126.

[2] Τὸ αὐτὸ ἄρα καὶ αἷμα καὶ γάλα, τοῦ Κυρίου πάθους καὶ διδασκαλίας σύμβολον. Id. ib. p. 127.

[3] Id. Strom. lib. 5. ib. p. 685. [4] Ib. p. 686. [5] p. 199.

refers[1] occurs in Cyprian's explanation of the clause in the Lord's prayer, "Give us this day our daily bread." And Cyprian, referring the word "bread" to Christ (not to the Eucharistical bread), warns us against such sin as will debar us from the right of communion (jus communicationis) in the Eucharist, for we shall thus be deprived of communion with Christ, and our Lord says, "except ye shall eat the flesh of the Son of man, &c., ye have no life in you." "And therefore," he says, "we ask that *our bread, that is, Christ,* (panem nostrum, id est, Christum) may be daily given to us." Here the words of our Lord in John vi. are most justly *applied,* not to eating the Eucharistical bread, but to show the necessity of our partaking of *Christ himself,* which we cannot do if we are involved in sin which shuts us out from the right of partaking of the Eucharist.

"St. Cyril of Jerusalem," adds the Archdeacon, "in like "manner rests his interpretation of this Sacrament upon what "was 'said by Christ on a certain occasion discoursing with the "Jews.' (Myst. Cat. iv. 4.)"[2]

Here again the Archdeacon uses words utterly unwarranted by the passage referred to, which he does not seem to have seen himself, having given a wrong reference. For St. Cyril (if the work be St. Cyril's, which is denied by Bishop Andrews) merely says, after speaking of the reception of the body and blood of Christ in the Eucharist, (which all allow to take place in the case of the faithful) "Christ formerly conversing with the Jews said, 'Except ye eat the flesh, &c.'" And he adds, that the Jews were offended, "not understanding spiritually what was said."[3] There is no pretext for saying that he "rests his interpretation of this sacrament upon" these words of Christ. He merely *applies* these words of Christ to that *spiritual* communion with his flesh and blood that takes place in the Eucharist.

The same remark holds good with respect to the Archdeacon's next quotation from Hilary. He observes, that "Hilary says, "when treating of the Holy Eucharist, 'there is no room for "doubting about the truth of His flesh and blood,' because Christ

[1] Cypr. De Orat. Domin. Op. ed. Fell. 1682. Pt. i. pp. 146, 147.

[2] p. 199.

[3] Ποτὲ Χριστὸς τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις διαλεγόμενος, ἔλεγεν, ἐὰν μὴ φάγητέ μου τὴν σάρκα, κ. τ. λ. . . . . ἐκεῖνοι μὴ ἀκηκοότες πνευματικῶς τῶν λεγομένων, σκανδαλισθέντες ἀπῆλθον κ. τ. λ. Catech. Mystag. iv. 1. Op. ed. Oxon. 1703. p. 293.

" ' himself says, My flesh is meat indeed and my blood is drink " indeed.' (De Trinitate, viii. 14, p. 955.)"[1] True, but what then? These words no doubt do show the reality of Christ's flesh and blood, and their effect where spiritually fed upon; and Hilary clearly maintains in the context, that we do *mystically* (sub mysterio) receive them in the Eucharist. But all this is nothing to the Archdeacon's purpose. *What he wants is a statement that when our Lord spoke in this chapter of eating his flesh and drinking his blood, he meant eating and drinking the consecrated elements in the Eucharist.* This alone will prove what he wants to establish, namely, that the consecrated bread and wine are the flesh and blood of Christ, and that he who eats and drinks the one does in that act eat and drink the other. And he has hitherto found nothing of the kind.

He seems resolved to forget, that no one doubts the *applicability* of these passages to what takes place in the Eucharist.

Such are the "decisive statements" in his favor adduced by the Archdeacon; and from them he proceeds to deal with other Fathers, who, as he is compelled to admit, "speak of the Body and Blood in connexion with that spiritual communion with himself as the source of truth and knowledge which is not limited to those occasions on which the Holy Eucharist is administered."[2]

I shall now, then, show the reader, first, what the real testimony of those Fathers is, and then notice the way in which the Archdeacon deals with their testimony.

First, Origen. Thus he speaks:—"Our Lord and Saviour " says, 'Unless ye eat my flesh,' &c.... His flesh is true meat and " his blood is true drink. For with the flesh and blood of his word, " as with pure meat and drink, he gives drink to and refreshes " the whole race of men..... Acknowledge that the things " written in the Divine volumes are figures, and therefore ex- " amine them as spiritual persons and not as carnal, and under- " stand the things that are spoken. For if you view those things " as carnal persons, they injure you and do not nourish.... For " if you follow the literal meaning of this that is spoken, 'Unless

[1] The Archdeacon will find on inspection that the work is not *paged*, but printed in *columns*, and the passage he refers to is on *col.* 956.

[2] p. 200.

"ye eat my flesh,' &c., the letter killeth." [1] Again:—"Let the "Jews carnally eat the flesh of the lamb, but let us eat the flesh "of the Word of God. For he himself says: 'Unless ye shall "eat my flesh, ye shall not have life in you.' That which we "now speak is the flesh of the Word of God; if at least we do "not as it were bring forth herbs for the weak, or milk for chil- "dren. If we speak what is perfect, what is healthy, what is "strong, we place before you the flesh of the Word of God to "eat." [2] Again, speaking of John vi. 51, he says,—"To eat "signifies there to know; for the mind eats that which it knows, "and does not eat that which it does not know." [3]

And again, after quoting John vi. 54, "Unless ye eat, &c.," he says,—"But we are said to drink the blood of Christ, not "only in the rite of Sacraments, but also when we receive his "words, in which life consists, as he himself also says: 'The "words that I speak are spirit and life.' He therefore is wounded "whose blood we drink, that is, we receive the words of his doc- "trine." [4]

And in another and most important passage, which I shall have again to refer to as directly opposed to one of the main doctrines of the authors under review, he thus distinguishes the bread spoken of in this chapter from the Eucharistic bread.

[1] "Dominus et Salvator noster dicit, 'Nisi manducaveritis carnem meam,' &c. . . . Caro ejus verus est cibus, et sanguis ejus verus est potus. Carnibus enim et sanguine verbi sui tanquam mundo cibo ac potu potat et reficit omne hominum genus . . . Agnoscite quia figuræ sunt quæ in divinis voluminibus scripta sunt, et ideo tanquam spiritales et non tanquam carnales examinate, et intelligite quæ dicuntur. Si enim quasi carnales ista suscipitis, lædunt vos, et non alunt . . . Si enim secundum literam sequaris hoc ipsum quod dictum est, 'Nisi manducaveritis carnem meam,' &c. occidit hæc litera." Orig. In Levit. hom. 7. Op. ed. Ben. tom. 2. p. 225. See also his De Oratione, tom. 1. pp. 244, 5, and 247.

[2] "Judæi carnali sensu comedant carnes agni, nos autem comedamus carnem Verbi Dei. Ipse enim dixit: 'Nisi comederitis carnes meas, non habebitis vitam in vobis ipsis.' Hoc quod modo loquimur, carnes sunt Verbi Dei; si tamen non quasi infirmis olera, aut quasi pueris lactis alimoniam proferamus. Si perfecta loquimur, si robusta, si fortiora, carnes vobis Verbi Dei apponimus comedendas." Id. In Num. hom. 23. ib. p. 359.

[3] Τὸ ἐσθίειν ἐνταῦθα τὸ γινώσκειν σημαίνει· τοῦτο γὰρ ἐσθίει νοῦς, ὃ καὶ γινώσκει, καὶ τοῦτο οὐκ ἐσθίει ὃ οὐ γινώσκει. Id. In Psalm. 77. ib. p. 771.

[4] "Bibere autem dicimur sanguinem Christi, non solum sacramentorum ritu, sed et cum sermones ejus recipimus, in quibus vita consistit, sicut et ipse dicit: 'Verba quæ locutus sum, Spiritus et vita est.' Est ergo ipse vulneratus, cujus nos sanguinem bibimus, id est, doctrinæ ejus verba suscipimus." Id. In Num. hom. 16. tom. 2. p. 334.

After having spoken of the Eucharist, he proceeds thus :—"And "thus much concerning *the typical and symbolical body*. But "many things might be spoken concerning the Word himself, who "became flesh and true food, which he who eats shall certainly "live for ever, no wicked person being able to eat it. For if it were "possible that any one living in sin could eat him who became "flesh, being the Word, and living bread, it would not have "been written, [John vi. 51.] that every one who eats this bread "shall live for ever." [1] Here he clearly draws a distinction between "the typical and symbolical body," that is, the Eucharistic elements, and the Word himself, the living bread, spoken of in John vi., of which we are to eat; manifestly referring to a spiritual act, a spiritual feeding upon Christ himself, which, however it may be connected in the case of the faithful with the act of the outward reception of the Eucharistic elements, is distinct from it, and may be independent of it. And it cannot be objected to this, as it has been to the former passages, that he is here giving an allegorical interpretation of the passage.

Let us pass to Athanasius. Speaking of John vi. 62—64, he says,—

"Here also he has spoken of both flesh and spirit with reference to himself. And he has distinguished the spirit from that which is according to the flesh, that they, believing not only in that which appeared of him, but also in that which was not seen, might learn, that the things which he speaks are not carnal, but spiritual. For to how many men would his body be sufficient for meat, that this should be the food of the whole world? But he therefore made mention of the ascension of the Son of man into heaven, that he might withdraw them from the contemplation of the body, and that they might learn that the flesh of which he spoke was *heavenly food from above*, and *spiritual nourishment* given by him. For 'the words that I have spoken,' he says, 'are spirit and life.' As much as to say, that which is manifested and given for the salvation of the world, is the flesh which I carry; but this food shall be given you by me spiritually with its blood, so that it may spiritually pervade

[1] Καὶ ταῦτα μὲν περὶ τοῦ τυπικοῦ καὶ συμβολικοῦ σώματος· πολλὰ δ'ἂν καὶ περὶ αὐτοῦ λέγοιτο τοῦ λόγου, ὃς γέγονε σὰρξ, καὶ ἀληθινὴ βρῶσις, ἣν τινα ὁ φαγὼν πάντως ζήσεται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, οὐδενὸς δυναμένου φαύλου ἐσθίειν αὐτήν· εἰ γὰρ οἷόν τε ἦν ἔτι φαῦλον μένοντα ἐσθίειν τὸν γενόμενον σάρκα, λόγον ὄντα, καὶ ἄρτον ζῶντα, οὐκ ἂν ἐγέγραπτο, ὅτι πᾶς ὁ φαγὼν τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον ζήσεται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. ORIGEN. Comment. in Matth. tom. xi. § 14. Op. ed. Ben. Paris. tom. iii. p. 500.

each of you, and be to all a preservative for resurrection to eternal life." [1]

Here there is no mention of the Eucharist, but the flesh spoken of is said to be heavenly food from above and spiritual nourishment, which is to be *spiritually given*, and *spiritually received*. No allusion, therefore, is made here to sacramental eating or the oral manducation of the consecrated elements.

Thus also speaks Eusebius of Cæsarea, when explaining the same words :—

"By which words he instructed them to understand spiritually the words that he had spoken concerning flesh and blood; for you must not consider me to speak of the flesh which I carry about me, as if you were to eat that; nor suppose that I command you to drink sensible and bodily blood. But understand well, that the words that I have spoken to you are spirit and life: so that his words and discourses are the flesh and blood of which he who always partakes, as one fed upon heavenly food, shall be a partaker of heavenly life. Therefore let not, he says, this offend you, that I have spoken of the eating of my flesh and the drinking of my blood; nor let the bare hearing of the things spoken by me concerning flesh and blood disturb you; for these things profit nothing if apprehended according to sense. But it is the Spirit that quickens those able to apprehend them spiritually." [2]

[1] Καὶ ἐνταῦθα γὰρ ἀμφότερα περὶ ἑαυτοῦ εἴρηκε, σάρκα καὶ πνεῦμα· καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα πρὸς τὸ κατὰ σάρκα διέστειλεν, ἵνα μὴ μόνον τὸ φαινόμενον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ ἀόρατον αὐτοῦ πιστεύσαντες μάθωσιν, ὅτι καὶ ἃ λέγει, οὐκ ἔστι σαρκικὰ, ἀλλὰ πνευματικά· πόσοις γὰρ ἤρκει τὸ σῶμα πρὸς βρῶσιν, ἵνα καὶ τοῦ κόσμου παντὸς τοῦτο τροφὴ γένηται; ἀλλὰ διὰ τοῦτο τῆς εἰς οὐρανοὺς ἀναβάσεως ἐμνημόνευσε τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ἵνα τῆς σωματικῆς ἐννοίας αὐτοὺς ἀφελκύσῃ, καὶ λοιπὸν τὴν εἰρημένην σάρκα βρῶσιν ἄνωθεν οὐράνιον, καὶ πνευματικὴν τροφὴν παρ' αὐτοῦ διδομένην μάθωσιν· ἃ γὰρ λελάληκα, φησὶν, ὑμῖν, πνεῦμά ἐστι καὶ ζωή. Ἴσον τῷ εἰπεῖν, τὸ μὲν δεικνύμενον καὶ διδόμενον ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου σωτηρίας, ἐστὶν ἡ σὰρξ ἣν ἐγὼ φορῶ· ἀλλ' αὕτη ὑμῖν καὶ τὸ ταύτης αἷμα παρ' ἐμοῦ πνευματικῶς δοθήσεται τροφὴ, ὥστε πνευματικῶς ἐν ἑκάστῳ ταύτην ἀναδίδοσθαι, καὶ γίνεσθαι πᾶσι φυλακτήριον εἰς ἀνάστασιν ζωῆς αἰωνίου. ATHANAS. Epist. 4. ad Serap. § 19. Op. ed. Ben. tom. i. Pt. 2. p. 710.

[2] Δι' ὧν ἐπαίδευεν αὐτοὺς πνευματικῶς ἀκούειν τῶν περὶ τῆς σαρκὸς καὶ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ λελεγμένων· μὴ γὰρ τὴν σάρκα, ἣν περίκειμαι, νομίσητέ με λέγειν, ὡς δέον αὐτὴν ἐσθίειν· μηδὲ τὸ αἰσθητὸν καὶ σωματικὸν αἷμα πίνειν ὑπολαμβάνετέ με προστάττειν. Ἀλλ' εὖ ἴστε, ὅτι τὰ ῥήματά μου ἃ λελάληκα ὑμῖν, πνεῦμά ἐστι καὶ ζωή ἐστι· ὥστε αὐτὰ εἶναι τὰ ῥήματα καὶ τοὺς λόγους αὐτοῦ, τὴν σάρκα καὶ τὸ αἷμα, ὧν ὁ μετέχων ἀεὶ, ὡσανεὶ ἀρτῷ οὐρανίῳ τρεφόμενος, τῆς οὐρανίου μεθέξει ζωῆς. Μὴ δὴ οὖν, φησι, σκανδαλιζέτω ὑμᾶς τοῦτο, ὃ περὶ βρώσεως τῆς ἐμῆς σαρκὸς, καὶ περὶ πόματος τοῦ ἐμοῦ αἵματος εἴρηκα· μηδὲ ταραττέτω ὑμᾶς ἡ πρόχειρος ἀκοὴ τῶν περὶ τῆς σαρκὸς καὶ αἵματος εἰρημένων μοι· ταῦτα γὰρ οὐδὲν ὠφελεῖ αἰσθητῶς ἀκουόμενα. τὸ δὲ πνεῦμά ἐστι τὸ ζωοποιοῦν τοὺς πνευματικῶς ἀκούειν δυναμένους. EUSEB.

Whether this is a strictly correct interpretation of the passage, or not, is not now the question. We are merely inquiring what interpretation was given to it by the Fathers; and here again, where it cannot be pretended that there is any attempt at allegorizing the words, they are formally interpreted as referring to spiritual acts of the soul.

There is also another important passage occurring in a work attributed to Jerome, and one which the Benedictine Editors, though not considering it a genuine production of Jerome as a whole, yet hold to be compiled from the most antient Fathers, and particularly from the writings of Jerome. The passage, therefore, affords good testimony on the point about which we are now inquiring. It is this,—"When Christ says, 'He that "eateth not my flesh and drinketh not my blood,' although it "may also be understood sacramentally, yet with greater truth "the body of Christ and his blood is the word of the Scriptures, "is the divine doctrine."[1]

On this passage I would make the same remark as on the preceding.

Now, what reply does the Archdeacon make to these authorities? First, he attempts to persuade the reader, as I have already observed, that they are speaking of blessings communicated in an "extraordinary manner"—an argument which falls at once before a mere perusal of their words. Then he urges, that they all elsewhere "contain express statements that the Holy Eucharist is referred to in this chapter."[2] But this assertion is wholly incorrect. They do *not* "state that the Holy Eucharist is referred to in this chapter." All that any of them do is to *apply* the words used in this chapter to what takes place in the Eucharistic rite in the case of the faithful, which is a very different matter. They "refer" the words to spiritual acts which may be performed independently of the Eucharist; and if they *apply* the words to the Eucharistic rite, it is because those spiritual acts peculiarly belong to that rite. And about

Cæsar. Contra Marcell. de Eccles. Theol. lib. 3. c. 12. ad fin. Demonstr. Evang. Colon. 1688. p. 180.

[1] Et quando dicit, qui non comederit carnem meam, et biberit sanguinem meum, licet et in mysterio possit intelligi, tamen verius corpus Christi et sanguis ejus sermo Scripturarum est, doctrina divina est. Breviar. in Psalm. Ps. 147. Inter. Op. Hieron. ed. Vallars. tom. vii. Appendix.

[2] p. 202.

this application of the words, or its propriety, I have no dispute with the Archdeacon. But this *application* of the words is insufficient for his purpose. What is necessary for his object is, that they should maintain that these words in their *proper* sense refer specially and directly to the Eucharist, and that the eating and drinking Christ's flesh and blood means eating and drinking the consecrated elements; and that any other sense of the words is but secondary or metaphorical. But this they do not do. On the contrary, they expound these words as properly applying to that spiritual communion with Christ which takes place independently of the Eucharist; and therefore, when they apply them to the Eucharist, they do not do so in the sense requisite for the support of the Archdeacon's doctrine.

Thus as to Origen. The Archdeacon says, that in the last passage but one I have quoted above, Origen "is referring plainly "to the Holy Eucharist, though he supposes the chapter to "speak also of that personal relation to Christ which the Divine "Mediator can bring about without the use of instruments."[1] But this is a very unfair representation of his words, because he clearly speaks of a reception of Christ's words being an "instrument" for drinking the blood of Christ as well as the Eucharist, and this view is fatal to the Archdeacon's doctrine. In fact, the words imply that even in the Eucharistic rite, the true eating and drinking of his body and blood is a spiritual act not to be identified with the reception of the consecrated elements.

The remark of Origen is precisely that which an opponent of the Archdeacon would make in commenting upon this passage of St. John's Gospel. That the words are *applicable* to what takes place, in the case of the believer, in the Eucharist, that is, in the celebration of the Lord's Supper, nobody doubts; and such an application of these words *now* is very natural; which is a very sufficient answer to the Archdeacon's question,[2] Why the Fathers should have so frequently applied these words to the Eucharist, unless it had been the received notion that our Saviour was speaking of the Eucharist in them?

And it will be found, on examination, that such an *application* of the words is all that can be shown in the case of many of the Fathers who are sometimes cited as maintaining the view supported by the Archdeacon.

[1] p. 202. [2] p. 204.

I must add also, that in the passages he has quoted from Origen and Athanasius, to show that they *referred* these words to the Eucharist, there is not even an *application* of them to the Eucharist, for the Eucharist is not mentioned, nor probably alluded to. But the Archdeacon has so accustomed himself to the notion, that wherever an eating of Christ's body is spoken of by the Fathers, they are alluding to the Eucharist (which is, in fact, begging the question at issue), that he cannot imagine any other sense to belong to such passages.

To the passage quoted from the Commentary on the Psalms attributed to Jerome, the Archdeacon can only reply, that it is "spurious."[1] But this is no sufficient answer to a passage from a work admitted to be compiled from the most antient Fathers.

Of another Father, St. Basil, the Archdeacon admits,[2] that in one passage[3] he "goes further almost than any one in identifying our Lord's flesh and blood rather with his benefits in general, than with that particular communication of himself, which is bestowed in the Holy Eucharist;" but because in another passage he exhorts men to partake of the Eucharist, because Christ said, "he who eateth my flesh, &c., hath eternal life," he puts down St. Basil on his side. It is difficult to understand how it is, that the Archdeacon cannot see, that the first interpretation of the words proves, that Basil did not hold that our Lord spoke them with a special reference to the Eucharistic elements, because that interpretation would be utterly inconsistent with such a notion; and therefore that when he applies them to the Eucharist, he does so merely because the blessings of which they speak are *now* peculiarly to be looked for *in that rite*, in which the believer spiritually eats the flesh of Christ and drinks his blood.

And I would here observe, by the way, that the very fact that the Fathers sometimes use these words of eating the flesh of Christ and drinking his blood, as applying to spiritual communion with Christ obtained independently of the Eucharist, and sometimes to the blessing obtained in the Eucharist, supplies us with a clear argument against the Archdeacon, that they did not hold that the reception of the consecrated elements was in any case to be *identified* with the act of eating and drinking our Lord's flesh and blood.

[1] p. 200. [2] p. 203. [3] Epist. viii. 4. vol. iii. p. 84.

All these writers, therefore, are clearly opposed to the notion, that when our Lord spoke in this chapter of eating and drinking his flesh and blood, he meant eating and drinking the consecrated Eucharistic elements.

The state of the case is this. Our Lord, some time before the institution of the Eucharist, delivered the general doctrine of spiritual feeding upon him, even upon that flesh and blood that he was about to give upon the Cross for the life of the world, and in this view called his body the bread of life. And I humbly conceive that the reason why this particular figure was introduced, that is, of our *eating* and *drinking* him, was to lead the minds of his hearers to a contemplation of him as a sacrificial victim, an atoning sacrifice, it being customary for those who would partake of the benefits of such a sacrifice to *eat* of it,—or rather perhaps more particularly as the true paschal lamb, the antitype of that of which all the Israelites were to eat. Our Lord seems to me to intimate this, when he says of the flesh which they were thus called upon figuratively to eat, "which I will give for the life of the world." True, his hearers at that time could not fully understand all that he alluded to; but in their case a *general* faith in him as the predicted Saviour might be, and doubtless from his own words on several occasions was, sufficient, until his death, resurrection, and ascension called for a more *particular* faith in his atoning work, and the eating and drinking of his flesh and blood in a peculiar sense. And hence he there speaks of *a reception of his words*, which involved an act of faith in him as the Saviour, as equivalent to eating his flesh and drinking his blood. Afterwards he instituted a particular rite, in which this spiritual act was to be outwardly represented by sensible acts and symbols, as well as inwardly performed. For, as Bishop Jewel says, "the signification and "substance of the Sacrament is to show us, how we are fed with "the body of Christ; that is, that like as material bread feedeth "our body, so *the body of Christ nailed on the cross, embraced and "eaten by faith, feedeth the soul.*"[1] And of course Christian writers have constantly and most properly referred to this chapter as showing the nature of the spiritual acts that are to be performed in the Eucharist. But this application of the words, the Archdeacon, like others who have before occupied the same

[1] Defence of Apol. Works, P. S. ed. vol. iii. p. 446.

ground, wishes to turn into a declaration, that our Lord, when speaking of our eating his flesh and drinking his blood, meant our eating and drinking the Eucharistic elements. In a word, he confounds the outward act with that inward and spiritual act that may be performed, not only in the Eucharist, but independently of it; and even, as more than one primitive Father testifies, in the sacrament of Baptism.

The Archdeacon proceeds to the Commentaries of Chrysostom, Augustine, and Cyril of Alexandria, and seems to think that their interpretation settles the matter; and very characteristically intimates, that it is only because we have no Commentary on the chapter in the writings of the earliest Fathers that any other notion could have been introduced. The Archdeacon must permit me to observe, that such argumentative leaps are not likely to have much weight with an impartial reader. And the three authors to whom he refers are much too distant from the Apostles to be so spoken of.

But in fact, as it respects Augustine at least, I must entirely deny the correctness of the Archdeacon's statement. Here again he seems to have trusted entirely to second-hand extracts from which to draw his conclusions; and certainly the extract he has given proves nothing. And this is the more remarkable, because in some other parts of his Works, especially in those against the Pelagians, where a controversial purpose was to be answered, Augustine certainly does use words, which, if we had had to judge from them alone, might have led us to suppose, that he considered, that the words were spoken by our Lord with special reference to the Eucharist. But in his Commentary on St. John he certainly does not, as he distinctly interprets this eating and drinking as a thing that may be done quite independently of the Eucharist. For he says on v. 55, that, "by this meat "and drink our Lord wishes to be understood the society "of his body and members, which is the holy Church con- "sisting of his predestined and called and justified and glo- "rified saints and faithful..... The sacrament of this thing, "that is, of the unity of the body and blood of Christ, is "prepared on the Lord's Table in some places daily, in others "at certain intervals, and from the Lord's Table it is taken by "some to life, by some to destruction: but the thing itself of "which it is the sacrament is to every man unto life, to no one

" unto destruction, whoever may be a partaker of it."[1] And he adds on v. 57, " He that eateth my flesh," &c.,—" This there- " fore is to eat that food and drink that drink, to abide in " Christ, and to have him abiding in them. And consequently " he that dwelleth not in Christ, and in whom Christ dwelleth " not, beyond doubt neither eats [spiritually, *in some MSS.*] his " flesh nor drinks his blood; [although he carnally and visibly " presses with his teeth the sacrament of the body and blood of " Christ, *in some MSS.*] but rather eats and drinks to his con- " demnation the sacrament of so great a thing?"[2] Here it is clear that Augustine speaks of the Eucharist, not as that which is directly referred to in our Lord's words, but only as the sacrament of that communion with Christ which is referred to; and manifestly distinguishes between the two, and holds that one may be partaken of without the other. And so he says in the same place,—" Therefore we live through him, eating him, that is, receiving him as eternal life."[3] And summing up the lesson to be derived from the whole discourse, he says, that it shows us " that we should not eat the flesh of Christ and the blood of " Christ only sacramentally, which many wicked persons also " do; but that we should eat and drink even to the partici- " pation of the Spirit, that we may dwell in the Lord's body as " members, that we may grow by his Spirit, and not be offended " even if many now eat and drink the sacraments with us for a " time, who will experience in the end eternal torments."[4] Here

[1] Hunc itaque cibum et potum societatem vult intelligi corporis et membrorum suorum, quod est sancta Ecclesia in prædestinatis et vocatis et justificatis et glorificatis sanctis et fidelibus ejus.... Hujus rei sacramentum, id est, unitatis corporis et sanguinis Christi alicubi quotidie, alicubi certis intervallis dierum in Dominica mensa præparatur, et de mensa Dominica sumitur; quibusdam ad vitam, quibusdam ad exitium: res vero ipsa cujus sacramentum est, omni homini ad vitam, nulli ad exitium, quicumque ejus particeps fuerit. AUGUST. In Johan. tract. 26. Op. ed. Antw. 1700. tom. iii. Pt. 2. col. 362.

[2] Hoc est ergo manducare illam escam, et illum bibere potum, in Christo manere, et illum manentem in se habere. Ac per hoc qui non manet in Christo, et in quo non manet Christus, procul dubio nec manducat [spiritaliter] carnem ejus, nec bibit ejus sanguinem [licet carnaliter et visibiliter premat dentibus sacramentum corporis et sanguinis Christi:] sed magis tantæ rei sacramentum ad judicium sibi manducat et bibit. ID. ib.

[3] Vivimus ergo nos propter ipsum, manducantes eum, id est, ipsum accipientes æternam vitam. ID. ib. col. 363.

[4] Hoc ergo tòtum ad hoc nobis valeat, dilectissimi, ut carnem Christi et sanguinem Christi non edamus tantum in sacramento, quod et multi mali, sed usque

again it is clear, that Augustine held, that the eating and drinking here spoken of had a much higher reference than to a sacramental eating and drinking, though the latter may be now one instrument for leading us to the former.

He therefore holds the eating and drinking here spoken of to be a spiritual act, which may be performed independently of any oral reception of the Eucharistic elements; and, in fact, in his comment on the former part of the chapter, which he applies to the Eucharist quite as much as the latter,[1] drawing no distinction between them, as Archdeacon Wilberforce has done, he says on the words "I am the bread that came down from heaven,"—"Therefore the Lord, being about to give the Holy "Spirit, called himself the Bread which came down from heaven, "exhorting us to believe in him. For to believe in him, that "is to eat the living bread. He who believes, eats."[2] And so on a former verse, "This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent," he says, — "This therefore is to eat "the meat that perishes not, but endures unto everlasting life. "Why do you prepare your teeth and stomach? Believe and "thou hast eaten."[3] Augustine, therefore, does not here refer our Lord's words, as to eating and drinking his body and blood, to the eating and drinking the Eucharistic elements, but to that spiritual act of the mind which the Eucharistic rite was specially intended to call forth (which rite therefore, after its institution, would be naturally suggested to the mind by our Lord's words, though originally unconnected with it) but which also takes place independently of it. And in another work, quoting the words, "Unless ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, ye have no life in you," he says,— "It seems to order an evil deed or crime; therefore it is a figure, "*directing us to hold communion with the Lord's passion, and*

ad Spiritus participationem manducemus et bibamus, ut in Domini corpore tanquam membra maneamus, ut ejus spiritu vegetemur, et non scandalizemur etiam si multi modo nobiscum manducant et bibunt temporaliter sacramenta, qui habebunt in fine æterna tormenta. Id. ib. tract. 27. col. 366.

[1] See on v. 48.

[2] Daturus ergo Dominus Spiritum Sanctum, dixit se panem qui de cœlo descendit, hortans ut credamus in eum. Credere enim in eum, hoc est manducare panem vivum. Qui credit, manducat. Id. ib. tract. 26. col. 358.

[3] Hoc est ergo manducare cibum non qui perit, sed qui permanet in vitam æternam. Ut quid paras dentes et ventrem? Crede et manducasti. Id. ib. tract. 25. 354.

" *sweetly and profitably revolve in our memory that his flesh was* " *crucified and wounded for us.*" [1]

And in a passage of his Works which is preserved by Bede, he expressly maintains, that we may be partakers of the body and blood of Christ without having partaken of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. " No one must doubt," he there says, " that " each one of the faithful is then made a partaker of the body " and blood of Christ, when in baptism he is made a member " of Christ; and that he is not separated from the communion " of that bread and cup, even if, before he eats that bread and " drinks the cup, he depart this life a member of the body of " Christ. For he is not deprived of the participation and benefit " of that sacrament, when he has become possessed of that " which this sacrament signifies." [2] He held, therefore, that the reality which this sacrament represents might be possessed independently of it, and therefore that the eating and drinking the body and blood of Christ was something very different from eating and drinking the Eucharistic elements, though in the case of the believer the former is connected with the latter.

And again elsewhere he *expressly* and *formally* distinguishes between the sacramental bread and the bread of life mentioned in this chapter. For on the petition in the Lord's Prayer, " Give us this day our daily bread," he says, " Our daily bread " means either all those things which sustain the wants of this " life. . . . . or the sacrament of the body of Christ, which we " daily receive, OR *the spiritual food concerning which the same* " *Lord says, 'Labour for the meat which perishes not,' and 'I am* " *the bread of life which came down from heaven.'* " [3]

[1] Facinus vel flagitium videtur jubere; figura est ergo, præcipiens passioni Dominicæ communicandum, et suaviter atque utiliter recondendum in memoria, quod pro nobis caro ejus crucifixa et vulnerata sit. ID. De doctr. Christiana. lib. iii. c. 16. tom. iii. Pt. 1. col. 40.

[2] Nulli est aliquatenus ambigendum, tunc unumquemque fidelium corporis sanguinisque Dominici participem fieri, quando in baptismate membrum Christi efficitur; nec alienari ab illius panis calicisque consortio, etiamsi antequam panem illum comedat et calicem bibat, de hoc seculo in unitate corporis Christi constitutus abscedat. Sacramenti quippe illius participatione ac beneficio non privatur, quando ipse hoc quod illud sacramentum significat invenit. AUGUST. in Bed. Comm. in 1 Cor. x.—Bed. Op. Col. Agripp. 1612. tom. vi. col. 365.

[3] Panis quotidianus, aut pro iis omnibus dictus est, quæ hujus vitæ necessitatem sustentant. . . . aut pro sacramento corporis Christi, quod quotidie accipimus; aut pro spiritali cibo, de quo idem Dominus dicit, Operamini escam quæ

I must also add, that the testimony of Chrysostom and Cyril of Alexandria, in their comments on this chapter, although they certainly seem to consider our Lord to have been speaking of the Eucharist in the discourse here recorded, is by no means favorable to the Archdeacon's views of the nature of the Eucharist. But this is a point which will come under our consideration hereafter. Of the testimony of Chrysostom we have already had a specimen in pp. 99, 100, above; and we may here add, that on the words, "This is a hard saying," in v. 60, he remarks that this was not the case, because our Lord was speaking "concerning doctrines, directing his discourse throughout to the faith that was to be placed on himself;"[1] and therefore he draws no distinction such as the Archdeacon supposes[2] to exist between the subject of the former part of the chapter and that of the latter. He goes on to remark, that they thought it "hard," because they did not understand our Lord's character; and then he proceeds to show, on v. 63, that our Lord's whole discourse is to be spiritually understood.

Without, however, going further into the Patristical authorities on this subject, or caring to disprove that some, particularly of the later Fathers, may have spoken of this chapter as if our Lord directly referred to the Eucharist in it, I have given, I conceive, very sufficient proof that there is good Patristical testimony for a very different interpretation of the passage in John vi. from that which the Archdeacon maintains; which is all for which I think it worth while to contend. And I have thus, I hope, given very sufficient evidence to the reader what ground there is for his confident boastings about the "primitive interpretation," the "received interpretation," of this passage; as if those who gave a different meaning to it had all antiquity against them.

Before, however, I quit this part of the subject, I must not forget to notice the last Patristical testimony which the Archdeacon quotes on this subject, and which is so characteristic a specimen of the way in which the highest claims and language of the loftiest tone are indulged in without the slightest founda-

non corrumpitur; et illud, Ego sum panis vitæ, qui de cœlo descendi. Id. De Serm. Dom. in monte, lib. 2. c. 7. Op. tom. iii. Pt. 2. col. 150.

[1] Περὶ δογμάτων, ἄνω καὶ κάτω στρέφων τὴν πίστιν τὴν εἰς ἑαυτόν. Chrys. In Joann. hom. 46. 2. Op. ed. Ben. Paris. tom. viii. p. 277.

[2] p. 205.

tion existing for them, that I must quote in full the words used by the Archdeacon on the subject:—

"The importance of St. Cyril's testimony," he says, "does not stop here. For these, it may be said, were but the statements of individuals, and may have failed to represent the judgment of the whole Church. But St. Cyril's interpretation of this chapter was introduced into the letter which, as President of a Synod at Alexandria, he addressed to Nestorius, and which was read with approbation at the Council of Ephesus. So that in referring our Lord's words to the Holy Eucharist, we are not only borne out by the private testimony of ancient writers, but have the highest sanction which can be given to any interpretation of Scripture, in the approval of one of those General Councils, which express the mind of the Spirit and the authority of the Church."[1]

Now I shall not stop here to consider the claim of such a meeting as that here alluded to, called by courtesy a General Council, to "express the mind of the Spirit and the authority of the Church." Nor shall I urge the consideration, that even a general approval of a very long letter does not pledge the parties approving it to every remark and every reference to Scripture made in it. But the simple fact is, that we have not the slightest testimony of the approval of the Council being given to the contents, except that they agreed with its writer in condemning Nestorius. The whole of this imposing statement is the mere creation of the Archdeacon's own imagination. He gives his reference, indeed,[2] as if he was speaking upon authority; but if we look to his reference we shall find nothing but the letter of Cyril, and if we proceed to that part of the account of the proceedings of the Council where the reading of the letter is noticed,[3] to which the Archdeacon does *not* refer us, we shall find that Peter, a presbyter of Alexandria, proposed that the letter should be read, and Flavianus assented, and ordered it, like a great number of other documents, to be entered into the account of their proceedings, and there the matter ended, without one word being uttered by anybody as to its contents.

Such is the way in which those among us, who are unable from circumstances to sift such statements, are being duped by representations utterly without foundation.

[1] pp. 209, 210. [2] Hardouin, vol. i. p. 1289. [3] Col. 1396.

The Archdeacon proceeds to account for the fact, that writers of repute, even among the Romanists, have denied that our Lord was speaking of the Eucharist in John vi.; and he gives as a reason, that they "had a theory to support, which the natural and received meaning of this passage was thought to oppose," namely, the communion in one kind; and he adds, "hence the received interpretation was called in question by Caietan, and others after him."[1] But so far from what he calls incorrectly "the received interpretation" being called in question only by Caietan, and others after him, a great number of the divines of the Church of Rome have held this interpretation to be an erroneous one. The following are mentioned by Aubertin as having maintained this view:—Two Popes, Innocent the Third and Pius the Second; four Cardinals, Bonaventura, de Alliaco, Cusanus, Caietanus; two Archbishops, Richardus Armachanus and Guerrerius Granatensis; five Bishops, Stephanus Eduensis, Durandus Mimatensis, Gulielmus Altissiodorensis, Lindanus Ruremundensis, Jansenius Gandavensis; and many very celebrated doctors, professors, and preachers, as Alexander de Hales, Richardus de Mediavilla, Joannes Gerson, Joannes de Ragusio, Gabriel Biel, Thomas Waldensis, Joannes Maria Verratus, Tilmannus Segebergensis, Joannes Eccius, Joannes Major, Astesanus, Conradus, Joannes Ferus, Conradus Sasgerus, Joannes Hesselius, Ruardus Tapperus, and Nicolaus Rigaltius.[2] I give the Latin names as those by which they are best known. And he adds, that Thomas Aquinas himself says on the passage, "Unless ye eat the flesh of the Son of man," &c.;—"It is to be observed, that "this may be applied either to the spiritual manducation, or "the sacramental. But if it is applied to the spiritual, it has "no difficulty; but if it is applied to the sacramental, a doubt "arises as to the meaning."[3]

And in the Scriptural annotations of Paulus Burgensis and Matthias Thoringus, which have been admitted into the *Biblia Glossata*, published under high authority over and over again in the Church of Rome, the sacramental interpretation of John vi. is formally rejected. Thus Paulus Burgensis says,—

[1] p. 211.

[2] See Edm. Albertini De Eucharistia. Daventr. 1654. fol. pp. 209, 210.

[3] Lect. 7. in Evangel. Joan. See Albertin. ib. p. 210.

"Although in John vi. it is said, 'Unless ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, ye have no life in you,' yet by this, according to the doctors, there is not laid upon us a necessary precept to receive this sacrament, but only the thing represented by the sacrament (rem sacramenti), as Augustine in his comment on the above passage of John declares."

And Matthias Thoringus says that the context of this passage shows,—

"Concerning what sort of eating and drinking it ought to be understood, namely spiritual, because it follows, 'He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood dwelleth in me and I in him.' Which the blessed Augustine expounding says, 'This is to eat that food and drink that drink, to dwell in Christ and to have Christ dwelling in him.' . . . This passage, 'Unless ye eat,' &c., has no direct reference to sacramental or corporal manducation. *For this saying was uttered some time before the sacrament of the Eucharist was instituted.* Therefore, from that passage we cannot derive a valid argument respecting sacramental communion. . . . Unless some *inquisitive heretic* (curiosus hereticus) should say, that those words were spoken concerning the use of the sacrament of the Eucharist *through foreknowledge, after the manner of a prophecy.* But such a mode of speaking cannot be made to rest on any passage of Holy Scripture. Such a remark, therefore, is *worth as little notice as there is ground for it;* especially when it is evident, from the clear words of the Gospel, that some have satisfied this precept, who, it is clear, have never communicated sacramentally, as is evident in the case of the thief, Luke 23, and that some have communicated under both kinds, and yet have not satisfied this precept, as is evident in the case of Judas. Therefore the Master of the Sentences, in his 4th bk. dist. 19, says, after the blessed Augustine, that these propositions are at the same time true,—He that eats not, eats, and he that eats, eats not."[1]

And the argument from the interpretation of the passage given by some of the Fathers was met in the Council of Basil by Joannes de Ragusio in this way,—That "the chief meaning" (principalis intellectus) of the passage is the "spiritual com-" munion," "but the doctors were often in the habit of *apply-*" *ing* it to the sacramental by *a certain adaptation.* For the "doctors, like the Church, are in the habit of using many

[1] Biblia cum Glossa, &c., In Ps. cx. ed. Antw. 1634. tom. 3. col. 1306 and 1308.

"authorities [of Holy Scripture] by way of adaptation, on "account of the similarity of the subject, or some other corre- "spondency."[1]

Luther also denied that our Lord spake these words of the Eucharist; but of course the Archdeacon sets down this also to a notion in Luther's mind, that if understood of the Eucharist they would oppose his doctrine. "Here, as in the case of Caietan," he says, "the received interpretation was abandoned for the sake of a theory."[2] Of course it is very easy to get rid of opposing authorities in this way; but I think some will rather be disposed to hold, that it was not Luther's *prejudices* but his *honesty* that induced him to maintain, that when our Lord said, "He that *eateth* my flesh and *drinketh* my blood dwelleth in me, and I in him," he was speaking of something that could be done at the time he spoke, and not of what could only be done in a rite not instituted till some time after.

So that when the Archdeacon concludes, that "if St. John did "not design to refer to the Holy Eucharist when he recorded "this discourse of our Lord, his Gospel must be unintelligible "to simple readers, since they could not fail to attribute this "sense to his words," and that this is "the first and plainest interpretation," and "can make its appeal to present reason"[3]— I must record my conviction, that any plain impartial reader "cannot fail" to see, that the "prophetic" interpretation of the words, making our Lord speak in them of a rite not instituted till long after, is most forced and unnatural; and if the world had not been so misled by the unorthodox teaching of divines as to the way in which we eat the flesh and drink the blood of our Lord, there would have been little danger that the meaning of the passage before us could have been misconceived.

As it respects the divines of our own Church, we shall see in a subsequent part of this work what their testimony is on this point.

Before I conclude this chapter, it may be well to call the reader's attention to the fact, that notwithstanding the confidence with which Scripture is alleged by the great body of the Romanists, and by the authors under review, as clearly proving their respective doctrines, we have admissions, on the part of a large number of the most eminent Romanists, of a contrary kind.

[1] See Albertin. ib. p. 210. [2] p. 213. [3] p. 213.

As it respects transubstantiation, it is distinctly admitted by Duns Scotus,[1] Ockham,[2] De Alliaco,[3] Gabriel Biel,[4] and Caietan,[5] that it cannot be proved by Holy Scripture; and Bellarmine confesses that this is not wholly improbable (non omnino improbabile.)[6]

And what is more, Cardinal Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, commenting on the words of institution in St. Matthew, says,—"There is not a word here by which it may be proved that there is a true presence of the flesh and blood of Christ in our Mass;" and further on he adds, that "it cannot be proved by any Scripture, that either layman or priest can make the body and blood of Christ of bread and wine, as Christ himself made them, since it is not contained in the Scriptures."[7]

[1] In Sent. 4. dist. xi. q. 3.
[2] In Sent. 4. dist. xi. q. 6 and 34.
[3] In Sent. 4. dist. xi. q. 6 art. 2.
[4] Lect. 40 in Expos. Can. Miss.
[5] In 3 D. Thom. q. 75. art. 7.
[6] De Euch. lib. 3. c. 23. Op. 1619. iii. 637. See, for other similar authorities, Albert. De Euch. pp. 102, 103.
[7] Neque ullum hic verbum positum est, quo probetur, in nostra missa veram fieri carnis et sanguinis Christi præsentiam.... Non potest per ullam Scripturam probari, quod aut laicus aut sacerdos quoties id negotii tentaverit, pari modo conficiet ex pane vinoque Christi corpus et sanguinem, atque Christus ipse confecit, cum nec istud in Scripturis contineatur. Joan. Roffens. Def. Reg. Assert. contra Babyl. Captiv. cap. x. Op. ed. Wirceb. 1597. col. 227, 228.

## CHAPTER IV.

EXAMINATION OF THE REASONABLENESS OF THE DOCTRINE OF ARCHDEACON DENISON, DR. PUSEY, AND ARCHDEACON WILBERFORCE, ON THE SUBJECT OF THIS WORK.

Having, I trust, proved the contrariety of the doctrine I am here opposing, to the testimony of Holy Scripture, I now proceed to show its *unreasonableness*, by arguments drawn from various general considerations, and an exposure of the sophisms by which it is supported.

Differing, as it does, in one respect, from the doctrine of Transubstantiation, it will nevertheless be found, that most of the arguments made use of by our great divines to show the erroneousness of that doctrine, are equally applicable against that under review. In fact, the notion that the body and blood of Christ are so in or with or under the form of the consecrated elements as to be received with them into the mouths of the communicants, is precisely that point in the doctrine of Transubstantiation, against which our great divines, when controverting that doctrine, have more especially objected. And the circumstance that they have not, except incidentally in a few cases, *applied* their arguments *formally* against the doctrine of Consubstantiation, is at once accounted for by the fact, that the doctrine of Consubstantiation has never, since the earliest period of the Reformation, when Cranmer was just emerging from the darkness of Popish superstition, been maintained by any party in this country. Our authors have the distinction of being the first to endeavour to lead us back to Popery by the same *via media* through which Cranmer passed on quitting it. The attempt, therefore, which has been made to take refuge in the fact, that the doctrine con-

tended for is not the precise doctrine of Transubstantiation, and so, to escape the effect of the adverse testimony of our divines, will be found upon examination to be wholly fruitless.

I shall divide this chapter into two parts, and consider—

I. The objections that present themselves to the doctrine under review.

II. The sophisms and fallacies by which it is supported.

Under the *first* division I observe,—

(1.) The doctrine in question is opposed to the testimony of Scripture as to Christ's departure from the world, ascension, and session at the right hand of the Father until the end of the world.

Not only are we told that Christ "was received up into heaven,"[1] "parted from his disciples and carried up into heaven,"[2] and "sitteth at the right hand of God,"[3] was "received up into glory,"[4] and "passed into the heavens;"[5] but our Lord distinctly warned his disciples, that he was about to leave them, and that they were not to have his bodily presence with them much longer. "I *leave the world*, and go to the Father."[6] "I am *no more in the world*, but these are in the world, and I come to thee."[7] "The poor always ye have with you, but me ye have not always."[8] And the exposition of Augustine on these last words will show how he understood them, as I shall point out in the next chapter. And St. Peter tells us, that "the heaven must receive him until the times of restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began."[9] And it is *from heaven* that he is to come at a future day.[10]

Now these passages are utterly irreconcileable with the notion of a real presence of Christ's body, vouchsafed to us whenever and wherever the Holy Eucharist is celebrated.

But, partly to escape the force of such passages, and partly to evade other difficulties, the sophism has been resorted to, that though Christ's body in its material form is now not on earth, but only in heaven, yet his body is present after a supernatural manner, *i. e.*, in a spiritual and immaterial form. The reasonableness of this notion will come under discussion in our

[1] Mark xvi. 19. [2] Luke xxiv. 51. [3] Col. iii. 1.
[4] 1 Tim. iii. 16. [5] Heb. iv. 14. [6] John xvi. 28.
[7] John xvii. 11. [8] Matt. xxvi. 11, and John xii. 8.
[9] Acts iii. 21. [10] Phil. iii. 20; 2 Thess. i. 7.

next objection; for the present I content myself with remarking that it does not in the least abate the contradiction. For if it was, as it is supposed to be, the real body of Christ, the very body that lived upon the earth and was crucified, our Saviour would not have left the world, but, on the contrary, his bodily presence would be much more diffused through the earth than it was previous to the crucifixion. As Bishop Taylor says,—"If Christ's body not only could, but must be every day in "innumerable places on earth, it would have been said that "Christ *is in heaven*, but not that *he is not here*, or that he is "gone from hence."[1]

And as the Bishop is a favourite witness with our authors, I think I cannot do better than add here a few very pertinent remarks he makes on this point. Among other similar observations he says:—

"If, after Christ's ascension into heaven, he still would have been upon earth, in the Eucharist, and received properly into our mouths, and in all that manner which these men dream, how ready it had been and easy to have comforted them who were troubled for want of his bodily presence, by telling them:—Although I go to heaven, yet fear not to be deprived of the presence of my body, for you shall have it more than before, and much better; for I will be with you, and in you; I was with you in a state of humility and mortality, now I will be with you with a daily and mighty miracle; I before gave you promises of grace and glory, but now I will become to your bodies a seed of immortality. And though you will not see me, but under a veil, yet it is certain, I will be there, in your churches, in your pixes, in your mouths, in your stomachs, and you shall believe and worship.—Had not this been a certain, clear, and proportionable comfort to their complaint and present necessity, if any such thing were intended? It had been so certain, so clear, so proportionable, that it is more than probable, that if it had been true, it had not been omitted .... When he went from hence, he was to come no more in person, and therefore he sent his substitute; and therefore to pretend him to be here in person, though under a disguise which we see through with the eye of faith, and converse with him by præsential adoration of his humanity, is, in effect, to undervalue the real purposes and sense of all the sayings of Christ concerning his departure hence, and the deputation of the Holy Spirit."[2]

[1] Bishop Taylor, Real Presence, Sect. ix. § 2. ed. 1654, p. 157.
[2] Id. ibid. § 4. pp. 161—163.

It has been urged against this objection, that the bodily presence of Christ has been occasionally vouchsafed locally on earth to a few individuals since his ascension. But even if we supposed that such was the case, it would not make any difference in the validity of this objection, because such occasional appearances to individuals are widely different from a constant bodily presence in the eucharistic elements in thousands of different places simultaneously all over the earth. Such occasional appearances are quite reconcileable with the doctrine of Christ's permanent abode in heaven, but his constant bodily presence upon all the communion tables throughout the world is not.

But, in fact, the appearances that are cited as showing that our Lord's bodily departure has not been complete, are such as are quite reconcileable with the notion that there was no local or bodily proximity.

The appearances manifested to St. Paul[1] (which are the chief *Scriptural* instances,—and none others are to be relied upon) may be readily accounted for without supposing a local or bodily proximity, as I shall show under the next objection.

Moreover these appearances are of a totally different kind from the presence supposed in the consecrated elements. In the former case, there was the visible manifestation of the body; in the latter case, while it is admitted that the body with which our Lord rose is in heaven, it is asserted that that very same body is present, whole and entire, in a spiritual and immaterial form, in every morsel of bread of every eucharist wherever celebrated all over the world.

The reader will observe, that the questions, What is the precise nature of our Lord's glorified body?—or *where* the body of Christ in the state in which it rose from the dead is?—or what is meant by its sitting at the right hand of the Father?—are questions which it is quite unnecessary to determine, as far as regards the subject before us. I have not entered, therefore, upon these points, because I observe that such considerations have often afforded an opportunity to disputants to run away from the point in question. It is *admitted*, that our Lord rose in a *material* body, and that that body is now in heaven, and remains

[1] Acts ix. 3—6, and xxiii. 11.

in heaven, and is not present in the Eucharist in the condition in which it thus exists in heaven. This is enough for our argument.

In fact, any reasoning derived from such considerations would not apply to the period when our Lord first established the eucharistic rite, and it is confessed that no other participation of Christ is to be expected now, than what the Apostles enjoyed on that occasion.

There is, indeed, a constant presence of Christ with us, of which he speaks when he says, "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." But this, by the universal consent of the Fathers whose interpretation of it we possess, (a few proofs of which I shall give under the next objection) was spoken, not of a bodily presence, but of his presence by his divinity.

This doctrine, therefore, makes the Articles of the Creed, as to Christ's ascension and session at the right hand of the Father, and future advent from thence to judge the world, a nullity.

But the great and fatal objection to the doctrine in question is,—

(2.) That Christ's body, being a human body, cannot be present in more than one place at one and the same time.

As the notion of the *multipresence* of Christ's body throughout the world lies at the very root of the doctrine in question, it is desirable to examine fully and particularly the grounds upon which it stands. And to do this, we must clearly understand the precise nature of the proposition maintained by the authors under review.

Let us begin with the statements of Archdeacon Wilberforce.

First, then, we must observe, that it is admitted, that our Blessed Lord is in heaven in a glorified body *of a material kind, circumscribed in extent, and occupying a certain place.* It is confessed, that though it is now what is called by St. Paul a spiritual and glorified body, the truth of his human nature requires, that it should be thus circumscribed and local.

"When our Lord was upon earth," says Archdeacon Wilberforce, "after his resurrection, He was not always visible to his disciples. But that His presence, when he was pleased to vouchsafe it, was *according to the laws of material existence*, we know from his own declaration: 'Handle me, and see, for a spirit hath not flesh and

bones, as ye see me have.' And *with this Body did He enter into that heavenly state in which He will continue till the end of all things.* NOW THE NATURAL CONDITIONS EVEN OF A GLORIFIED BODY—THE CONDITIONS, THAT IS, WHICH PERTAIN TO IT BY REASON OF ITS MATERIAL CHARACTER AND HUMAN EXISTENCE—ARE, THAT IT IS PRESENT UNDER A DEFINITE FORM, AND IN A DEFINITE PLACE. So we learn from the statements of Scripture and of the Church." [1]

"The natural presence of our Lord's humanity is in heaven, subject to the conditions of place and form, which are characteristic of other human bodies." [2]

And the same doctrine is held by the Romanists. For the Council of Trent lays it down, that our Saviour, "*according to his natural manner of existence,* is always seated in heaven, at the right hand of the Father," though "nevertheless present with us, in many other places, sacramentally in his own substance" in a supernatural manner.[3]

This therefore being admitted, it is not necessary to give any proof on this point. The language of Hooker respecting it, I have already referred to.[4]

And it is further admitted that,—

"If our Lord were a mere man, and had no mode of presence, except that which is accordant to the laws of material existence, it follows that He could not be present except in the place which he possesses in heaven." [5]

It is confessed therefore by all, that according to that mode of existence which our Lord's glorified body has in heaven, it would not be possible for it to be present in more than one place. All discussion, therefore, as to the nature of the change that took place in our Lord's body after his resurrection, would be irrelevant; as it is admitted that it was not such as to give to that body a capacity of multipresence. In fact, it is not pretended that what takes place now in the Eucharist is different from what took place at the Last Supper of our Lord with his

[1] WILBERF. on the Euch. pp. 153, 154. 3rd ed. p. 131.

[2] Id. ib. p. 162. 3rd ed. p. 139.

[3] Neque enim hæc inter se pugnant, ut ipse Salvator noster semper ad dexteram Patris in cœlis assideat juxta modum exsistendi naturalem, et ut multis nihilominus aliis in locis sacramentaliter præsens sua substantia nobis adsit, &c. CONCIL. TRID. Sess. 13. cap. 1. See also BELLARM. De Christo, lib. iii. c. 12.

[4] See p. 50, above. See also Bp. JER. TAYLOR, Real Presence. Sect. xi. §§ 15 and 24. ed. 1654. pp. 216 and 232.

[5] WILB. ib. p. 154. 3rd ed. p. 132.

disciples *before* the resurrection, and therefore any supposed change after the resurrection would not be a sufficient foundation for the doctrine in question.

But it is maintained, that *another mode of presence* belongs to our Lord's body, by reason of a "peculiar privilege with which it is invested,"[1] and this is called a "*supernatural*" mode of presence; and "to say that our Lord's presence in the Holy Eu-"charist is supernatural, is to affirm that while his humanity "has a presence, which, except when He wills it otherwise, is "accordant to the laws of material existence, it has also a pre-"sence of another sort, which is independent of those laws."[2] And "it is by virtue of those new qualities which our Lord's "humanity has gained by oneness with Deity, that it exists "under those conditions in which it is given to man in the "Holy Eucharist."[3]

On account, therefore, of the "peculiar privileges" with which the manhood of our Lord is thus supposed to be invested, it is held that it may be present in a supernatural way in many places at once. The Lutheran doctrine of *ubiquity*, indeed, is disowned.[4] It is held that the body of Christ cannot be *omnipresent*, but it is contended that it may be, through the peculiar privileges it possesses from its union with the Godhead, *multipresent*; which is thus expressed:—

"It is no interference, therefore, with the inalienable prerogatives of Deity, to suppose that *capacities of presence*, far exceeding the ordinary conditions of nature, as well as other unusual gifts, should be bestowed upon a *created substance*. And on what of all created substances should they be bestowed so suitably, as on that humanity which by personal union was one with God? Was it not the very principle of the Incarnation that the Infinite and the finite were brought face to face in the Person of Christ? It must be remembered only, that whereas such capacities belong to Godhead by the necessity of its nature, they belong to manhood accidentally only, and by gift. In this consideration lies the safeguard against

[1] Ib. p. 155. 3rd ed. p. 132.
[2] Ibid. p. 152. 3rd ed. p. 130.
[3] Ibid. pp. 155, 6. 3rd ed. p. 133.
[4] The Lutherans maintain that the properties of the Divine nature are so communicated to the human nature in the person of Christ, that our Lord's human nature has the property of omnipresence. This doctrine Archdeacon Wilberforce, with the Romanists, rejects; and in this, I suppose, Dr. Pusey and Archdeacon Denison agree with him.

that error of ubiquity which at times was advocated by Luther. Our Lord's manhood neither did, nor could, participate in that Omnipresence which is characteristic of Godhead; but He has been pleased to bestow upon it *a certain capacity of presence beyond that which other bodies possess*, that it may be the instrument of his own gracious will." [1] "Whatever of power or *special presence* the flesh [of Christ] possesses, is derived from the immediate appointment of Him who has taken it into Himself." [2]

"On this account it is that our Lord's life-giving presence in the Holy Eucharist is properly described as *supernatural*. If it were his Godhead only which was bestowed in this sacrament, such presence and such mode of action would be exactly consonant to the laws of its nature. But since it is his Manhood to which these acts are ascribed, since they are attributed to a nature which is common to ourselves, and to which such powers are foreign, it is plain that they can belong to it only in a manner which is supernatural. So that the natural presence of our Lord's humanity is in heaven, subject to the conditions of place and form, which are characteristic of other human bodies. But the presence of his humanity in the Holy Eucharist is not accordant with the ordinary conditions which belong to man's nature. He brings it about through that union which has taken place in his Person between manhood and Deity—it is peculiar and *supernatural*." [3]

"If our Blessed Lord's humanity had no other than that *natural* presence which belongs to common men, his *Real* Presence would in like manner be confined to that one place which he occupies in heaven. But *by reason of those attributes which his manhood possesses through its oneness with God*,[4] he has likewise a *supernatural* presence; the operations of which are restricted only by his own will." [5]

[1] Ibid. p. 160. 3rd ed. p. 137.

[2] Ibid. p. 161. 3rd ed. p. 138.

[3] Ibid. p. 162. 3rd ed. p. 139.

[4] I must observe on the words which I have put in italics, that they are quite inconsistent with the Archdeacon's disclaimer, as given above, of the high Lutheran doctrine. It is here distinctly asserted, that his Manhood *possesses* Divine attributes through its oneness with God.

[5] Ibid. p. 177. 3rd ed. p. 152. This doctrine of Archdeacon Wilberforce, as to the power of multipresence belonging to the body of Christ through its union with the Godhead, is precisely the doctrine advanced, and, as Hospinian considers, originated, by Gerson, the famous Chancellor of Paris, who flourished about the year 1404. His doctrine, as stated by Hospinian, was this,—"Christum, quatenus creatura est, et corpus finitum, non posse uno et eodem tempore, in pluribus et diversis locis esse: a divina tamen natura, in unam personam cum ipso unitam [unita], humanam naturam hanc prærogativam accipere, et hanc ei communicari, ut in cœna saltem sua (et in hac quidem tantùm et sola, in nulla re, genereve ullo, aut tempore alio) simul esset in pluribus, omnibus

The hypothesis is, not that there is an *invisible* presence of Christ's body, according to its mode of existence in heaven, but that there is a presence of Christ's body in a *totally different form and character* from that in which his body is present in heaven.

And the particular nature of this supernatural presence is thus described:—

To the question, "Whether our Lord is present in this ordinance under a *definite form*, and in ANY PARTICULAR PLACE,"[1] the answer is in *the negative*.

"It is a *sacramental*[2] presence—the presence, that is, of a *res sacramenti*, which is not, in itself, an object to the senses of men. We have no reason, therefore, to suppose that *form* and *outline* belong to it; because these are the conditions through which things become an object to the senses of men."[3] It is "an object only to faith, and to the mind."[4] "And yet," he adds, "there is one way in which our Lord's Body may be said to be present with form and place in the Holy Eucharist," as it may be said to have "the form of the elements, and to occupy that place through which the elements extend. *As the spirit may be said to be present in that place where the body is situated*, and as light may be said to assume the shape of the orifice through which it passes, so it may be said that the *res sacramenti* borrows place and shape from the *sacramentum*, with which it is united by consecration."[5]

This, we may observe, is precisely the doctrine of Bellarmine.[6]

But though this "supernatural" or "sacramental" presence is not "local," yet it is "the *essential* or *substantial* presence of Christ's Body."[7]

nimirum cœnæ suæ locis. Atque ita timide et verecunde hoc asseruit, ne vel infinitas vel omnipotentia humanæ naturæ tribueretur ejusmodi, quæ humanam naturam prorsus everteret, et ex homine Deum faceret, et falsum Christum introduceret, atque ita tamen τὸ ἄτρεπτον καὶ ἀσυγχυτὸν in naturis conservaretur, secundum Conciliorum canones. Sic igitur Gerson ex unione personali realem idiomatum communicationem introduxit; *quod ante ipsum a mille quadringentis annis nemo in Ecclesia Christi docuit*, neque de reali communicatione tali quisquam unquam." Hospinian. Histor. Sacram. Pt. 2. p. 103. ed. Genev. 1681.

[1] Ibid. p. 163. 3rd ed. p. 140.

[2] The reader will observe the use of the word "sacramental" here, by which the proper meaning of the phrase "sacramental presence" is *assumed*, instead of being *proved*.

[3] Ibid. p. 164. 3rd edit. p. 140.

[4] Ibid. p. 163. 3rd ed. p. 139.

[5] Ibid. pp. 164, 5. 3rd ed. pp. 140, 141.

[6] In sacramento non est localiter [corpus Christi], nisi ratione dimensionum panis. BELLARM. De Sacr. Euch. lib. 3. c. 3.

[7] pp. 165—173. 3rd ed. pp. 141—148. See Table of Contents.

"He is present himself, and not merely by his influence, effects, and operation; by that *essence*, and in that *substance*, which belongs to him as the true Head of mankind." [1] —— "When our Lord spoke of his Body and Blood as bestowed upon his disciples in this Sacrament, he must have been understood to imply that *he himself, Godhead, soul, and body*, was the gift communicated." [2] —— "The body and blood which he bestowed . . . was that self-same body and blood which he had taken of the blessed Virgin, of her substance: and which so shortly afterwards he offered upon the Cross . . . and as he then gave it himself to his twelve apostles, so he still communicates it by the ministration of their successors to the faithful in the Holy Eucharist." [3]

It is His "*natural*" body that is present,[4] though in a "supernatural" way. And this body of Christ so present in or under the consecrated elements is received into *the mouth* with them; for he expressly says, that "Christ's body is ORALLY received" by the communicants.[5]

According to this doctrine, then, Christ's "natural" body is present in its "essence" and "substance," even that very body which was "offered upon the cross;" but yet not "locally" nor as being "in any particular place," nor as having any form or quantity or dimensions; [6] and still nevertheless is in the hand of the priest, and in the mouthof every communicant!!

Such is Archdeacon Wilberforce's explanation of the doctrine of the multipresence of Christ's body in a supernatural way in the eucharistic elements. And it will be observed, that the Archdeacon admits, that the supposed *presence and mode of action* of Christ's body are *exactly consonant to the laws of the nature of the Godhead*, and "foreign" to the nature of man. So that we have to suppose at the very outset, that our Lord's manhood is gifted with powers of action exactly consonant to the laws of the nature of the Godhead, and particularly that it can make itself present simultaneously in as many places as it pleases, and does in fact make itself present simultaneously in hundreds of thousands of places scattered over the whole world. And the only difference between the Manhood and the Godhead in this

[1] p. 178. 3rd ed. p. 152.
[2] p. 91. 3rd ed. p. 78.
[3] pp. 93, 94. 3rd ed. p. 80.
[4] p. 391. 3rd ed. p. 337.
[5] p. 409. 3rd ed. p. 352.
[6] This is precisely the doctrine of Thomas Aquinas. See his Summ. Theolog. Pt. 3. q. 76. art. 8. &c. &c.

respect, according to this view of the matter, is, that the latter is necessarily by its very nature *present everywhere*, and the latter not necessarily or actually so, but only *present wherever it pleases*, and by a power which is the result of a Divine gift. How far this notion is consistent with the doctrine of the Incarnation, or with the due distinction between the Divine and human natures in the Person of Christ, I leave the reader to judge.

He admits also, that "it is true, that such a supernatural "presence of our Lord's Body is alien from the common laws "of material action, and may seem almost to imply, that the "essence of a body is identical with its power." And he then adds, what seems difficult to reconcile with his previous statements,—"So that probably it would not be wrong to speak of "our Lord's presence in the Holy Eucharist as resembling a "*dynamic* rather than a *natural* presence."[1] But what a *dynamic* presence of our Lord's body can mean, but a presence of the power or influence of the body, as the sun is *dynamically* present to the earth when it is warmed with its rays, it is difficult to conceive. And we may hence see the straits to which the Archdeacon is reduced to rescue his doctrine from the difficulties that present themselves to it in his own mind.

The same is the doctrine of Dr. Pusey. In speaking of the presence of Christ in the eucharistic elements, Dr. Pusey remarks,—

"The Presence of which our Lord speaks has been termed sacramental, supernatural, mystical, ineffable, as opposed not to what is real, but to what is natural. The word has been chosen to express, not our knowledge, but our ignorance; or that unknowing knowledge of faith, which we have of things Divine, surpassing knowledge. We know not the manner of his Presence, save that it is not according to *the natural Presence of our Lord's human flesh, which is at the right hand of God;* and therefore it is called Sacramental. But it is a presence without us, not within us only; a Presence by virtue of our Lord's words, although to us it becomes a saving Presence, received to our salvation, through our faith. It is not a Presence simply in the soul of the receiver .... while the consecrated elements remain in their natural substances, still, since our Lord says, 'This is my Body,' 'This is my Blood,' the Church of England believes that 'under the form of Bread and Wine,' so consecrated, we

[1] Ibid. p. 167. 3rd ed. p. 143.

'receive the Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ.' (Homilies).[1] And since we receive them, they must be there, in order that we may receive them . . . . . Christ hath said, 'This is my Body;' He saith not, by what mode. We believe what He, the Truth, saith. Truth cannot lie. How he bringeth it to pass, we may leave to his Omnipotency. *It is a law which he hath impressed upon physical nature, that two bodies cannot be in the same place at the same time. And yet we receive, without doubting,*[2] *that our Lord, in his spiritual Body, passed, on the morning of the Resurrection, through the sealed tomb.* For the Angels rolled away the stone to show that he was risen.[3] He passed through the closed doors, so that the disciples thought that 'it was a spirit,' as he had passed before, *illæsa virginitate*, through the doors of the Virgin's womb. We do not stay to inquire in what way the substance of his Body passed through the substance of the closed doors. Enough that God has said it.[4] As it passed, it must have been *in the same place, penetrating but not displacing them.* Still less need we ask, by what law of nature that Sacramental Presence can be, which is not after the order of nature, but is above nature." [5]

Of course I need hardly remind any one conversant with the Romish controversy, that these arguments for the actual presence of our Lord's Body in an immaterial form in the eucharistic elements *together with* the Bread and Wine, are precisely the same as those of the Romanists for its presence in the eucharistic elements *in the place of* the Bread and Wine.

It may be desirable to add one more extract.

"When then our Blessed Lord, recalling the sanction of the Old Testament, by the very form of the words, added to them, 'This is my Blood of the New Testament, which is shed for you and for many for the remission of sins;' what else could the Apostles think, but that our Lord meant, that it was *really and truly and in a Divine way His Blood*, and that they now and henceforth

[1] With this professed quotation from our Homilies I have dealt in pp. 40—47, above.

[2] When Dr. Pusey says "we," I suppose he means himself and the Romish authors he had been reading. Our great English divines, so far from "receiving without doubting" all this, wholly repudiate the notion. Witness Bp. Taylor and others quoted below.

[3] How did Dr. Pusey learn this? The Greek word ἠγέρθη, which he here quotes, will certainly not show it.

[4] But Dr. Pusey has yet to prove, that God *has* "said it," as I shall presently show.

[5] Sermon. pp. 21—24.

should in a new and nearer way be united with him and live by him, as he himself had promised, 'He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me and I in him.'" [1]

Dr. Pusey holds, therefore, that while "the natural presence of our Lord's human flesh" is "at the right hand of God," his flesh in an immaterial form is present in all the different places in which the Eucharist is celebrated; and, apparently, as "*penetrating but not displacing*" the bread.

Archdeacon Denison's doctrine is precisely the same, as may be seen, without further quotations, from those which I have given pp. 11—18 above, particularly from one in p. 14. Indeed the Archdeacon himself, as appears from the passage I have cited from him in p. 22 above, "gladly and thankfully" refers to their proofs of the presence of Christ's body and blood "in the consecrated bread and wine," "rather than make what would be either a reproduction of their statements, or a greatly inferior statement of his own."

And the doctrine of all three *on this point* is precisely the same as that of the Romanist Harding in his controversy with Bishop Jewel. Commenting on Jewel's denial of the doctrine "that Christ's body is or may be in a thousand places or more at one time," he states the Romish doctrine as follows:—

"Among the miracles of this blessed sacrament one is, that one and the same body may be in many places at once, to wit, under all consecrated hosts. As for God, it is agreeable to his Godhead to be everywhere *simpliciter et proprie;* but as for a creature, to be but in one place only. But as for the body of Christ, it is after a manner between both. For, whereas it is a creature, it ought not to be made equal with the Creator in this behalf, that it be everywhere; but whereas it is united to the Godhead, herein it ought to excel other bodies, so as it may in one time be in more places under this holy sacrament. For the uniting of Christ's natural body unto the Almighty Godhead duly considered, bringeth a true Christian man in respect of the same to forsake reason and to lean to faith, to put apart all doubts and discourses of human understanding, and to rest in reverent simplicity of belief.

"Thereby through the Holy Ghost persuaded, he knoweth that, although the body of Christ be natural and human indeed, yet, through the union and conjunction, many things be possible to the

[1] Ibid. p. 28.

same now, that to all other bodies be impossible; as to walk upon waters, to vanish away out of sight, to be transfigured and made bright as the sun, to ascend up through the clouds; and after it became immortal, death being conquered, to rise up again out of the grave, and to enter through doors fast shut. Through the same faith he believeth and acknowledgeth, that, according unto his word, by his power it is made present in the blessed sacrament of the altar, *under the form of bread and wine*, wheresoever the same is duly consecrated, according unto his institution in his holy Supper; and that *not after a gross or carnal manner, but spiritually and supernaturally, and yet substantially; not by local but by substantial presence;* not by manner of quantity, or filling of a place, or by changing of place, or by leaving his sitting on the right hand of the Father, but in such a manner as God only knoweth, and yet doth us to understand by faith the truth of his very presence, far passing all man's capacity to comprehend the manner how.

"Whereas some against this point of belief do allege the article of Christ's ascension, and of his being in heaven at the right hand of God the Father, bringing certain texts of the Scriptures pertaining to the same, and testimonies of ancient doctors signifying Christ's absence from the earth; it may be rightly understanded, that he is verily both in heaven at the right hand of his Father in his *visible and corporal form*, very God and man, *after which manner he is there and not here;* and also in the sacrament *invisibly and spiritually*, both God and man in a mystery; so as the granting of the one may stand without denial of the other, no contradiction found in these beings, but only a distinction in the way and manner of being."[1]

I need hardly observe, that this statement is throughout *identical with* that of Archdeacon Wilberforce.

In fact, all notions of the real substantial presence of Christ's body in the eucharistic elements, whether it is by transubstantiation or consubstantiation, or any other way, and whether it be in a material or spiritual and immaterial form, involve of necessity the doctrine that our Lord's body can be substantially present in many different places at the same time. And we shall find that this is precisely the point against which our divines have chiefly directed their arguments when opposing the doctrine of Transubstantiation. The absence of any *direct application* of their arguments, except incidentally, against the

[1] HARDING'S Answer as inserted in Jewel's Reply, Art. 6. Jewel's Works, P. S. ed. vol. i. pp. 480, 481.

doctrine of Consubstantiation, or co-existence, is fully accounted for by the fact, that that doctrine was never formally maintained in this country since the earliest period of the Reformation.

Of how little practical value, indeed, is the difference between Transubstantiation and Consubstantiation, (though, as is usual in such cases, great stress has been laid upon it by the high Lutheran divines,) we may see by the frank admission of Luther himself in one of his works, issued in 1528, who there says, "that he had hitherto taught and yet taught, that it matters little, and is a question of small moment, whether any one believes that the bread remains in the Eucharist, or does not remain and is transubstantiated."[1]

The whole difference, indeed, between the two amounts merely to this, Whether, *besides* the body and blood of Christ substantially, though immaterially, present in the eucharistic elements, the communicants eat a small piece of bread and drink a small portion of wine. And it is obvious that this is not a question of any moment. In truth, some of the scholastic divines themselves believed that the substance of bread and wine remained in the consecrated elements.

Now this doctrine of the multipresence of Christ's body involves these two notions,—*first*, that besides that form of body which our Lord bears in heaven, and which is material and local, and can only be in one place, our Lord has another form of body, of a different kind, which, while the material body is in heaven, can be present in the eucharistic elements on earth; that is, that our Lord has now *two bodies* distinct from each other, and of a different kind, which are nevertheless one and the same: *secondly*, that this latter body is immaterial, capable of almost infinite multiplication and simultaneous presence all over the world, having no parts or dimensions, being capable of being in or under the form of the smallest atom of bread, and actually present continually in all parts of the earth at one and the same time. For the doctrine maintained is—not the presence of a power or virtue or efficacy in the elements flowing from Christ's body, for that

[1] Se hactenus docuisse et adhuc docere, parum referre, nec magni momenti quæstionem esse, sive quis panem in Eucharistia manere, sive non manere et transubstantiari credat. LUTHERI Confess. Magn. Op. Jen. tom. 3. fol. 485. b. See HOSPIN. Hist. Sacram. Pt. 2. p. 95.

notion is wholly rejected[1]—but the presence of *the natural body itself* in a supernatural way and an immaterial form.

Hence this doctrine supposes, that at our Lord's Last Supper with his disciples, there were two bodies of Christ present, which were one and the same, and yet different;—the one material, sitting at the table; the other spiritual and immaterial, and multiplied into as many bodies as there were guests at the table; and both the material and the immaterial were the same, and yet were two; for the one sat at the table, and the other, whole and perfect, was in the mouths of every one of the disciples!!

Now it is natural to inquire, *first*, upon what these statements are founded. How is it proved, that these "capacities of presence" do belong to the human nature of our Lord? This inquiry Archdeacon Wilberforce endeavours to answer in pp. 94—100,[2] and attempts to prove, first that this supposed presence of Christ in the eucharistic elements is *possible*, and secondly that it is *probable*. The arguments for its possibility, when sifted of a mass of vague generalities about our ignorance of the nature of bodies, and some Patristical testimonies which I shall consider hereafter, are briefly these: that our Lord's body "walked on the sea" and was "transfigured in the mountain," "emerged from the unopened tomb" and "entered, the doors being shut, into their assembly," and was "the Body of God, which must needs receive new qualities from its relation to that Deity with which it was personally united."[3] He reverts subsequently to the same point, and observes,—"If our Lord were a mere man, and had no mode of presence, except that which is accordant to the laws of material existence, it follows that He could not be present except in the place which he possesses in heaven. Any other mode of presence which can be attributed to his human nature, must belong to it by reason of some peculiar privilege with which it is invested. And that his humanity was likely to be invested with some peculiar privileges of this sort, we should gather from his own words, both before and after his resurrection. *This is surely the fullest sense of those expressions in which he speaks of himself as about to come again;*

[1] Wilb. p. 172. 3rd ed. p. 147. I should add here, that I am no advocate for the admissibility of such a notion, though certainly it is a shade better than that of the actual presence of the natural body itself.

[2] 3rd ed. pp. 80—86.

[3] p. 96. 3rd ed. p. 82.

*and of the perpetual presence which he pledged to his disciples.* These things could not refer to his Godhead, which must always have pervaded both time and place by its unalterable presence." And having adverted again to our Lord's conveyance of his body (as he supposes, citing Augustine) "through a closed barrier," he adds,—"It is by virtue of those new qualities which our Lord's humanity has gained by oneness with Deity, that it exists under those conditions in which it is given to men in the Holy Eucharist."[1]

Dr. Pusey's proofs on the same head are, as we have seen, two of those mentioned by Archdeacon Wilberforce, and another, likewise borrowed from the Romanists, of our Lord passing, *illæsa virginitate,* through the Virgin's womb.

Archdeacon Denison, by the nature of his reference to Archdeacon Wilberforce and Dr. Pusey on this point, must, I suppose, be considered as consenting with them in these proofs.

Archdeacon Wilberforce proceeds to prove, that what he maintains on this point is not only *possible* but *probable.* And his argument is this. That "the truth of our Lord's mediation" "not only implies that he condescended to be a sacrifice "and intercessor on man's behalf towards God, but likewise "that he made *his manhood the channel through which the per-* "*fections of the Creator extended themselves to the creature.*" "That such is the manner in which heavenly gifts have been "bestowed upon men, is evident from *the statements of Scrip-* "*ture respecting grace;*" for "grace is never spoken of in the "Gospels, except as associated with the humanity of God the "Son." "We must be united by grace to Christ, as we were "united to Adam by nature. Neither should it surprise us "that the processes should present some analogy; that *if the* "*poison of the one is transmitted through his flesh, so His flesh* "*should be the medium through which is transmitted the virtue of* "*the other.*"[2]

So that the mean by which we are made partakers of the gifts of grace is the oral reception of Christ's flesh and blood in the Eucharist. The flesh and blood of Christ have, through their union with the Godhead, a principle of life in them, and when

[1] pp. 154—6. 3rd ed. pp. 132, 133. [2] pp. 98—100, 3rd ed. pp. 84, 85

they are swallowed by us in the Eucharist, that principle of life is imparted to us from and by them ![1]

Let us first consider the arguments for the *possibility* of the presence of Christ's body as supposed. And I observe first, that every one of the instances adduced in support of it fails in the very point which is the greatest difficulty of all. The greatest difficulty involved in the doctrine we are considering is, that, according to it, while our Lord's Body is present in an immaterial form in an almost infinite number of places, at the same time, all over the world, his Body is also present in a material form in heaven. It is this duality of body, and the simultaneous multipresence of one of the two in all parts of the world, from which the strongest objections arise to the doctrine in question; and none of the instances adduced give the slightest evidence in favor of the possibility of such duality and multipresence. None of them, even as represented by the Archdeacon and Dr. Pusey, would prove more than that there were occasions when the materiality of our Lord's Body was for a time suspended. There was no duality or multipresence of body shown in any of them. Let the body be in the most spiritual form imaginable, that does not give it the capacity of being simultaneously present in many different places.

Let us examine them separately.

Our Lord, it is said, "walked upon the sea." True, but that does not even show that his body became an immaterial body. It gives no evidence that his body was divested of its weight, or any of the ordinary properties of human nature. What happened is more easily accounted for by supposing that the weight was miraculously sustained by the immediate power of the Godhead; especially when we find that our Lord walked thus to the ship, and got in, and joined his disciples, who certainly were not conscious that he was in the form of a spirit, though they had at first mistaken him for one. And if it was so, it proves nothing for the Archdeacon, because it cannot be pretended that his body was present in a material form some-

[1] The Archdeacon will perhaps wish us to remember here, that he considers faith to be necessary in the recipient, that a salutary effect may be produced. I therefore remind the reader that such is the case, leaving him to estimate the value of such a limitation when combined with such doctrine. The effect upon his own doctrine of the introduction of this limitation I shall consider hereafter.

where else at the same time. Besides, our Lord enabled Peter to do the same. Was Peter's body made a spirit?

As it respects our Lord's transfiguration in the mountain, I am at a loss to understand how the Archdeacon can apply it to the point in question, and I must therefore pass it over.

The next instance is the supposed case of our Lord's Body having left the tomb before it was opened. In the first place, there is no evidence that this was the case. For by comparing the accounts given by the Evangelists (Matt. xxviii. 1—6. Mark xvi. 1—6. Luke xxiv. 1—6.) it appears that the earthquake, and the rolling away of the stone from the door of the sepulchre, took place before any of our Lord's followers came to the sepulchre. And why should we not suppose that our Lord rose at that time? The events seem naturally to point to that as the time of our Lord's resurrection. What other object was there to call forth this supernatural agency? There is every reason, therefore, to suppose, that our Lord's body did *not* rise through the *unopened* tomb.

But even if we imagined that such was the case (which I do not admit) it would not help the doctrine in question. It would not prove more than that our Lord's body was enabled miraculously to pass through the stone. The utmost therefore that our authors could deduce from it would be, that our Lord's body could be *either* material or immaterial, according to his pleasure. It would not follow from it that our Lord's body could be *both* material and immaterial at the same time, and exist in one form at one place, and in another at another place. There was no multiplication of the body, or simultaneous existence of it in different places under different forms. The only case that would have been parallel to that supposed, would have been one of this kind: that the material body should have remained in the grave, and yet his body in an immaterial form should have risen through the unopened tomb, and appeared at the same time to many of his disciples in different places. But this is very different from the reality.

This instance, therefore, is utterly useless for their purpose.

The same may be said of the next that is adduced, namely, our Lord's entering into the assembly of the disciples, the doors

being shut. We have no right, in the first place, to assert that our Lord's Body *did* penetrate through the closed doors, for there were various ways in which our Lord might have entered without this taking place. As, at another time, his material body passed through the midst of the Jews without their being aware of it, and at another the eyes of his disciples were holden so that they did not know him; and the locked gate of the prison opened of its own accord to Peter; so on this occasion the door may have been miraculously opened for our Lord without the disciples being conscious of anything until it pleased our Lord to allow them to see him in the midst of them. And his words as reported by St. Luke are observable, "Handle me, and see that *it is I myself*, for a spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see me have." (Luke xxiv. 39.) They were to see that it was *Christ himself*, by feeling his body to be *a material body*. And surely the body that appeared to the disciples was of the same sort as that which came through the doors. It will hardly, I suppose, be asserted that it was immaterial while coming through the doors, but material when it stood inside. But even if it had been as the Archdeacon and Dr. Pusey represent it, (though I do not admit that it was,) still they can raise no argument out of it; for certainly it was our Lord's *material* body that stood in the midst of them, for he told Thomas to handle him, and see that he was not a spirit; and there is not the slightest ground for saying that our Lord's body was present anywhere else, in any form whatever, at the same time. The utmost therefore that it could prove would be, that the materiality of our Lord's body could be suspended at his will while he was passing from one place to another. But this is a small part of what they have got to prove in support of their doctrine.

As to Dr. Pusey's additional instance of our Lord passing through the Virgin's womb, *illæsa virginitate*, I shall merely reply with Bishop Taylor, that we know nothing about the matter: and remind him that even the Jesuit Maldonatus[1] admits, that Origen, Tertullian, Ambrose, Gregory Nyssen, Epiphanius, Jerome, Theophylact, and Eusebius, all taught *Christum aperuisse vulvam matris*; to which, if necessary, others might be added.

All these instances, therefore, fall entirely short of what is wanted for an argument in favor of the doctrine in question.

[1] Comment. in Luc. 2.

What is wanted is a clear instance of the simultaneous presence of our Lord's body in several different places; and neither before nor after our Lord's resurrection, can one be found.

And when Dr. Pusey talks of our "receiving without doubting" all these alleged instances of our Lord's Body passing through other bodies, it is a species of language which, I must say, is not very creditable to him; for it either indicates how little he is acquainted with the way in which our great divines have spoken on the point, or it is an attempt to surprise the reader into an admission of his doctrine, by leading him to suppose that there is a universal agreement as to the facts alleged.

And as our authors attribute so much value to the testimony of antiquity, it may be well to inquire briefly what it is on this point.

The argument is, that the body of Christ may be in the eucharistic elements after the manner of existence of a spirit, *because* it passed through the unopened sepulchre and the closed doors of the room.

Now this was precisely the argument of the antient heretics, who denied that our Lord had a true body. They referred to the supposed fact (which, however, has yet to be proved) that our Lord passed through the closed doors, as proving that his body had only the appearance of a body,[1] and was in fact a spirit.

But so far from the Fathers holding that the Body of Christ became immaterial and like a spirit, to enable it to do this, they are most careful on all occasions to vindicate its *material* character against those early heretics who maintained that it was of an immaterial kind, not having learnt the modern notion of our Lord's body being two diverse bodies, material and immaterial, and yet but one body, all at the same time. What took place they put down to an exercise of Divine power in some way, without any alteration in the nature of Christ's body for the purpose. And one at least, said to be Justin Martyr, but certainly an author of good repute, expressly condemns the notion, that the body of Christ became a spirit to enable it to act as supposed. His words are these:—

[1] Quando dicit Manichæus, et similis Manichæorum: Dominus non resurrexit in corporis veritate, et ut scias non fuisse verum corpus, clausis ingressus est ostiis,—nos quid dicemus? 'Domine, libera animam meam a labiis iniquis, et a lingua dolosa.' Pseudo-Hieron. Secund. expos. super Ps. 119. (vers. nostr. 120.) vers. 2. Op. ed. Ben. et Vallars. tom. vii. Append.

"As our Lord walked upon the sea, not by the change of his body into a spirit, but by his Divine power made the sea fit to walk upon, which naturally is not so, not only for his own body, but for that of Peter, so by his own Divine power he quitted the tomb when the stone was laid upon it, and entered where his disciples were when the doors were closed . . . and . . . the disciples being alarmed at his entering in this way, he permitted them to handle those parts of his body that had suffered, because *he had not effected his entrance among them by a change of his body into a spirit, but with his solid body*, through his divine power effecting that which was beyond nature."[1]

And to the same effect writes Cyril of Alexandria, cautioning his readers at considerable length, and on various grounds, against supposing that our Lord's body, when he entered through the closed doors, was any other than that *material* body that suffered on the cross and was laid in the grave; and ascribing what took place to the exercise of a peculiar Divine power (*ἀφάτῳ τινὶ δυνάμει καὶ θεοπρεπεῖ*); observing,—"Let no "one say, how when our Lord was *in a material body* (*ἐν "σώματι τῷ παχεῖ τυγχάνων*) did he enter without hindrance, "although the doors were shut; but let him rather think, that "the inspired Evangelist says nothing of this kind respecting "any of us, but of him who sits beside God the Father, and "does all things without difficulty, whatsoever he will."[2] And he proceeds to show, that the truth of the resurrection required, that the body should be a material body, never dreaming of the absurd notion, that his body became an immaterial body for the purpose of transit.

And so Augustine, though he held that the body of Christ after his resurrection became a *spiritual body*, and so of a somewhat different nature from what it was before, as he believed

[1] "Ωσπερ οὐ κατὰ τὴν ἐκ τοῦ σώματος εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα τροπὴν περιεπάτησεν ὁ Κύριος ἐπὶ τὴν θάλατταν, ἀλλὰ τῇ θείᾳ αὐτοῦ δυνάμει βατὴν ἐποίησε τὴν εἰς περιπάτησιν ἄβατον θάλατταν, οὐ μόνον τῷ ἑαυτοῦ σώματι, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῷ τοῦ Πέτρου, οὕτως τῇ ἑαυτοῦ θείᾳ δυνάμει καὶ τοῦ μνήματος ἐξῆλθε τοῦ λίθου ἐπικειμένου τῷ μνήματι, καὶ πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς εἰσῆλθε τῶν θυρῶν κεκλεισμένων . . . . πτοηθέντων τῶν μαθητῶν ἐπὶ τῇ τοιαύτῃ εἰσόδῳ ἐπέτρεψεν αὐτοις ψηλαφᾶν τοὺς πεπονθότας τόπους τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ, ὅτι οὐ κατὰ τροπὴν τοῦ σώματος εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα ἐποίησεν εἰς αὐτοὺς τὴν εἴσοδον, ἀλλὰ ἐν παχυμερεῖ σώματι τῇ θείᾳ αὐτοῦ δυνάμει ποιητικῇ τῶν ὑπὲρ φύσιν. PSEUDO-JUSTIN. MART. Quæst. et Resp. ad Orthod. q. 117. Op. ed. Otto, Jen. 1847. iii. pt. 2. p. 182.

[2] CYRILL. ALEXANDR. Comment. in Joann. lib. xii. In c. xx. v. 19, &c. Op. ed. Auberti. tom. iv. pp. 1090—92.

ours also will be after the resurrection, yet he maintained that that spiritual body, both in our Lord's case and in ours, is a true material body. In such a body he describes our Lord as sitting at the right hand of the Father; and he describes spiritual bodies as "having the substance of the flesh, but without any carnal corruption."[1] And therefore, though he seems to give two somewhat diverse explanations of the circumstance of our Lord's entering where the disciples were with the doors closed; in one place attributing it to Divine power, and in another to the change that took place in our Lord's body after the resurrection; yet in *both* he recognizes the *material* nature of our Lord's body in the act of passing through (if he did pass through) the closed doors.

Thus, in his Comment on the passage of St. John, where this circumstance is mentioned, he says,—"To *the mass of the body* where the divinity was present the closed doors offered no obstacle."[2]

In other places, however, he seems to attribute it to the subtle nature of the raised body of our Lord. For instance, observing that our bodies will be spiritual bodies (spiritalia) at the resurrection, and will not need corruptible food, but will have *the power to eat and consume it*, otherwise our Lord would not have taken it after his resurrection, who gave us an example of the resurrection of the body, appearing with all his limbs and making use of them, and even showing the marks of his wounds,—marks which were there, Augustine holds, not of necessity, but by an exercise of power—he adds, "And the "readiness of this power he then chiefly displayed, when he "either manifested himself in another form; or, on his disciples "being gathered together in a house with the doors shut, "appeared *in his true form*."[3]

And elsewhere he seems even to think that the bodies of the saints after the resurrection will be able to do the same. For, speaking of the facilities which will belong to the future "spiri-

[1] Non animale sed spiritale erit, habens quidem carnis, sed sine ullo carnali corruptione substantiam. AUGUST. De Civit. Dei, lib. xxii. c. 24. Op. vii. 522.

[2] Moli autem corporis ubi divinitas erat, ostia clausa non obstiterunt. AUGUST. In Johan. Evang. tract. 121. § 4. Op. iii. Pt. 2. col. 589.

[3] Cujus potestatis facilitatem tunc maxime ostendit, cum vel in alia forma se demonstravit, vel in domo discipulis constitutis, cum ostia clausa essent, VERUS apparuit. AUGUST. Ep. Paulin. et Theras. ep. 95. § 7. Op. ii. 197.

tual body," he observes that "our Lord passed his body through "doors, where the ray of our eye could not pass. After the "resurrection, his disciples being gathered together in one "place, he suddenly appeared, the doors being shut. Where "we could not see, he could even enter. Let no one say, This "indeed the Lord's body could do; but does it follow that "mine also will be able to do so? Here also receive full "assurance from that Spirit that spake by the Apostle. For it "is said concerning the Lord himself: 'Who shall change our "vile body, to be like his own glorious body.'" [1]

Thus, though he considers the facilities possessed by the raised body of our Blessed Lord, and those of the saints, to be much greater than they were before, he still believes them to be true bodies, material, finite, and circumscribed, and such as have the power of eating and consuming food, and therefore certainly not such as is supposed to be present in the eucharistic elements. And, in fact, the change that took place after the resurrection cannot be applied to what happened at the Last Supper, which is admitted to be the test of what happens now in the Eucharist.

All these arguments are, as I need hardly remind any reader of ordinary information on the subject, taken from the Romish armoury. And they who wish to see how they are dealt with by our great divines, may consult the works of Bishop Morton or Bishop Jeremy Taylor, as cited below.[2]

And the reader will also observe, that in the attempt to extract an argument, for the existence of our Lord's body after the manner of a spirit, from the circumstances referred to, both the Romanists and our authors have shown themselves the followers of the antient *heretics*, and not of the antient *Fathers*.

[1] Dominus noster, quod radius oculi nostri non potest, corpus etiam per claustra trajecit. Post resurrectionem in loco uno constitutis discipulis suis, subito apparuit ostiis clausis. Quà nos videre non possumus, ille potuit et intrare. Nemo dicat, Hoc quidem potuit, sed Domini corpus, numquid continuo etiam meum poterit? Et hinc accipe ab Spiritu, qui de Apostolo loquebatur, plenam securitatem. De ipso quippe Domino dictum est, "Qui transfigurabit corpus humilitatis nostræ conforme corpori gloriæ suæ." AUGUST. Serm. 277. c. 12. Op. v. 781.

[2] MORTON, Of the Institution of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ. 2nd ed. 1635. fol. bk. iv. ch. 8. § 7. pp. 275 et seq. TAYLOR, Of the Real Presence, &c. Sect. xi. § 32. pp. 246—249. ed. 1654.

The Archdeacon proceeds to remark, that his doctrine "is "surely the fullest sense of those expressions in which our "Lord speaks of himself as about to come again, and of the "perpetual presence which he pledged to his disciples."

Now, as to the first of these two, I must say that I think the Archdeacon is the very first person who has ever ventured to hint that our Lord's promises of coming again refer to his presence in the Eucharist; and it would be a positive waste of time to discuss such an argument. It is wonderful that one who talks so much about the testimony of primitive antiquity can venture upon such a statement. I content myself with referring him to the Creed. And I must add, that the Archdeacon appears to me to be, in more than one point, in serious opposition to the very elementary articles of the Christian faith, as laid down in the antient Christian Creeds.

That "the perpetual presence which our Lord pledged to his disciples" is to be considered as referring to the presence of his body and blood in the eucharistic elements is, I believe, a notion equally new. Will he be contented with the explanation of the phrase given by Augustine, Origen, and Hilary? If not, I will promise to add many more similar testimonies to its meaning, if he will support his view of it by any probable arguments or testimonies. But in the meantime I hold these witnesses to be sufficient. Augustine, then, after speaking of Christ as sitting at the right hand of the Father, and having replied to the question,—"How shall I take hold of him who "is absent? How shall I reach my hand to heaven that I may "take hold of him who sits there?"—"Send forth faith, and "thou hast taken hold of him"—adds,—"But since that is true "which he says, 'Behold, I am with you always, even to the "end of the world;' he has departed, and yet is here; he has "returned, and yet forsakes us not: for *he has taken his body* "*into heaven*, but he has not withdrawn *his power* (majestatem) "from the world."[1]

[1] Quomodo tenebo absentem? Quomodo in cœlum manum mittam, ut ibi sedentem teneam? Fidem mitte, et tenuisti.... Sed quoniam verum est quod ait, Ecce ego vobiscum sum usque ad consummationem sæculi, et abiit, et hic est, et rediit, et nos non deserit: corpus enim suum intulit cœlo, majestatem non abstulit mundo. AUGUST. In Johann. tract. 50. Op. ed. Ben. Antw. iii. 2. col. 458.

So, again, Origen says,—

"According to the nature of his *divinity* Christ is not absent from us, but he is absent according to the dispensation of *that body which he assumed* . . . . For it is not the man who is 'wherever two or three shall be gathered together in his name.' Nor as man is he 'with us always, even to the end of the world.' Nor is he present as man wherever the faithful are collected together, but *the divine virtue* which was in Jesus."[1]

And so Hilary, commenting on the passage, "Lo, I am with you always, even to the end of the world," attributes his presence to his being "a Spirit, penetrating and containing all things;"[2] and adds a similar explanation of his promised presence where two or three are gathered together in his name, namely, that it is by "a present *virtue* extending itself everywhere, his Spirit filling all things."[3]

I believe, indeed, that the Archdeacon's notion is utterly destitute of any support worth having.

But I must proceed to remark, that this doctrine involves absurdities and self-contradictions of no ordinary kind.

The almost invariable reply to every difficulty started against the doctrine in question, on account of the impossibilities it involves, is, that every thing is possible to God, that Divine omnipotence can do anything.

Now this no doubt is, in itself, perfectly true. But in its application we shall do well to remember first, that, as Casaubon reminds us, and instances in the Apollinarians and Arians, as noticed by Gregory Nazianzen and Augustine, it is *an old refuge*

[1] Secundum hanc divinitatis suæ naturam non peregrinatur, sed peregrinatur secundum dispensationem corporis quod suscepit . . . . . Nec enim est homo, qui est ubicumque duo vel tres in nomine ejus fuerint congregati. Neque homo nobiscum est omnibus diebus usque ad consummationem sæculi. Nec congregatis ubique fidelibus homo est præsens, sed virtus divina quæ erat in Jesu. ORIGEN. Comment. Series in Matth. § 65. Op. ed. Ben. Par. iii. 883.

[2] Spiritus namque est omnia penetrans et continens. HILAR. PICT. Tract. in Psalm. 124. § 6. Op. ed. Ben. Par. col. 405.

[3] Non enim secundum nos corporalis est, ut cum alicubi adsit, absit aliunde: sed virtute præsenti, et se quacumque est aliquid porrigenti, cum replente omnia ejus spiritu in omnibus sit, tamen ei qui in eum credat adsistit. Nam et tribus vel duobus in nomine suo congregatis erit præsens. ID. ib.

*of the antient heretics.*[1] When reduced to straits by the arguments of their adversaries, a favorite plea was the Omnipotence of God. All the absurdities, extravagances, and self-contradictions that the wit of man ever devised on such points, have been defended on the ground that everything is possible with God.

And when we come to apply this general truth, that everything is possible with God, to particulars, we must also recollect, that there are some things which the very perfection of the Divine nature places beyond the limits of what is possible. We cannot, for instance, suppose the possibility of anything being willed and not willed by God at the same time; nor of anything being done which implies a self-contradiction. Bellarmine himself says, that Thomas Aquinas and all theologians maintain, "that God is said to be omnipotent because he can do every-"thing which does not involve a contradiction (non implicat "contradictionem); for that which involves a contradiction is "not in any way possible;" and he admits that the sole question is, what does, and what does not, involve a contradiction?[2]

Now the doctrine in question involves more than one serious self-contradiction. It involves the self-contradiction that one finite created body, remaining one, should at the same time exist in different places in two totally different forms, one material, the other immaterial, one tangible and passible, the other intangible and impassible, that is, should be two bodies. It involves the self-contradiction that one body should be in millions of different places, separated from one another, at the same time and under different circumstances. It involves the self-contradiction that a body remaining a body should nevertheless be without any of those properties that are the distinguishing characteristics of a body, that is, be a body and yet not a body, but a spirit, at one and the same time.

It thus takes from the body of Christ the characteristics of *unity, locality,* and *quantity.*

[1] Scitum est piorum Patrum, Omnipotentiam Dei et asylum esse hæreticorum, quo se recipiant ubi rationibus fuerint victi. Is. Casaub. Exercit. ad Annal. Baron. Exerc. vii. An. 9. Num. 1. ed. Genev. 1663. 4to. p. 189.

[2] De Euchar. lib. 3. c. 2. Op. ed. cit. iii. col. 564.

(i.) It involves the self-contradiction that one finite created body, remaining one, should at the same time exist in different places in two totally different forms, one material, the other immaterial, one tangible and passible, the other intangible and impassible, that is, should be in fact two bodies.

Putting aside for a moment the question as to the possibility that our Lord's material body, while remaining the same body, should be made by Divine power immaterial, so as to enable it to pass through stones and closed doors, the possibility of the supposed *duality* of Christ's body, and its multipresence in the way imagined, is a question which falls entirely beyond that of what Divine omnipotence can effect. For it rests upon the notion that God can will the body of Christ to be *material* (as on all hands it is confessed that He did), and yet will *that very same body* to be at *the very same time not material.* A more direct and express self-contradiction could not be conceived. If there is a material body of our Blessed Lord in heaven, and an immaterial body of our Lord on earth, these are *two* bodies, and cannot be one and the same. Nor does such an assertion clash in the slightest degree with the doctrine of the Divine Omnipotence. For instance, it is no limitation of the Divine Omnipotence to say, that what God has made to be two men cannot be supposed to become, by Divine power, one man *at the same time;* or that one man, remaining one, cannot be *at the same time,* through Divine agency, two; or that anything that has actually been created or done cannot be made not to have been created or done. And it is as little a limitation of the Divine omnipotence to say, that Christ's body, remaining one, cannot be supposed to be made, by Divine power, two at the same time. And the doctrine here opposed clearly supposes the co-existence of two different kinds of bodies of Christ, one material, abiding in heaven, and the other immaterial and multiplied to an infinite number, existing whole and entire in every fragment of the eucharistic bread. And at the same time the exigency of the case demands, that these two be considered as one and the same, for on all hands it is granted, that the body eaten in the Eucharist is to be the very body that suffered on the Cross. But it is a self-contradiction to say, that one and the same body can be at the same time material and immaterial, divisible and indivisible, passible and impassible, tangible and intangible.

(ii.) It involves the contradiction, that a finite created body is in millions of different places at the same time and under different circumstances.

That a finite created body should be in different places at the same time involves a contradiction; namely, that one body, remaining one, can at the same time be many bodies. For as it is not pretended that the Body of Christ extends from heaven to all the different communion tables on which it is supposed to be, or, in other words, that there is a continuity of the Body of Christ through the space between its seat in heaven and the earthly table, but on the contrary, that the whole Saviour, "Godhead Soul and Body," exists in every fragment of the consecrated bread, there are as many different bodies of Christ as there are communion tables on which it is present, for they are all separate, and divided one from another, and therefore are distinct and separate bodies. And consequently, though they may be all alike, they certainly cannot be one. But the proposition is, that they are nevertheless one; which is a direct contradiction.

And from this follows another contradiction, namely, that while the whole of a thing is in one place, yet the whole of the same thing can be in millions of other places at the same time.

To the objection, that the same thing can be by Divine power in different places at the same time, because God himself is always so, the reply is obvious, namely, that it is inaccurate to say that God is in different places at the same time, because his presence is a continuous and uninterrupted presence throughout all space and all time.

Moreover, when the Body of Christ exists on a communion table where it had not previously existed, it must either have come there from heaven, or have been produced there. But if it came from heaven, it must have left heaven to come there; which *confessedly* it does not.[1] And if it is produced there, either by creation or from some substance, it is a *new* body, and not that which suffered on the Cross. And Bellarmine and the Tridentine Catechism evidently stumble in endeavouring to

[1] Fieri non posse constat, ut corpus Christi in sacramento fit, quod ex uno in alium locum venerit: ita enim fieret, ut a cœli sedibus abesset: quoniam nihil movetur, nisi locum deserat, a quo movetur. CATECH. ROM. Pt. 2. c. 4. qu. 31.

meet this difficulty. For all that they can say is, that the body comes there "by the conversion of the bread into it."[1] But if the bread is *converted into* the body of Christ, the body so formed is clearly a *new* body, and not that born of the Virgin Mary. And therefore the Romanists ordinarily say now, that the substance of the bread *vanishes* and the body of Christ comes *in its place;* but if it comes from heaven or by creation (and it is difficult to see how else it can come) they are self-condemned. And this difficulty applies quite as much to the doctrine of Consubstantiation as to that of Transubstantiation. Whether or not the substance of the bread and wine remains, is a question which does not touch this difficulty.

Further, if the same body could be present in a number of different places and under different circumstances at the same time, all manner of self-contradictions would hold good respecting it. For the same body would be moving and not moving, eaten whole and perfect by millions and yet not eaten at all; sitting at the right hand of God in heaven, and at the same time being carried in procession in various churches on earth, and also lying on the communion table in other churches.

And if the Body of Christ may be in millions of different places at the same time, there is no reason to be given why it should not be everywhere. Bellarmine indeed denies this, but admits that such ubiquity of Christ's body would require Divine immensity.[2] And hence, Archdeacon Wilberforce, following Bellarmine,[3] contends that the Body of Christ enjoys only "capacities of presence," so that, though it can be present in as many places as it pleases, yet not everywhere. But for this distinction there is no possible ground to be alleged. The same power by which the Body of Christ is enabled to be

[1] Creari autem corpus Christi minus credibile est, ac ne in cogitationem quidem cadere hoc potest. *Relinquitur ergo* [as a last resource], ut in sacramento fit corpus Domini, quod *panis in ipsum convertatur*. CATECH. ROM. ib.—*Per conversionem panis in ipsum*. BELLARM. De Euch. lib. 3. c. 4.

[2] Esse Christum [he is speaking of *Christi carnem*] ubique, ubicumque sunt hostiæ consecratæ, non est esse absolute ubique, nec in infinitis locis simul, nec postulat immensitatem; esse autem ubique, ubicumque est Verbum, est esse absolute ubique, *et esse vel esse posse in infinitis locis simul et plane immensitatem divinam requirit*. BELLARM. De Christo, lib. iii. c. 18. Op. tom. i. col. 425.

[3] See BELLARM. ib. c. 9. col. 405.

present (as is alleged) in all the Churches in the world at the same moment would, by the force of the argument itself, enable it to be present in them all if they were multiplied tenfold, and so on up to any amount; and *pari ratione* if they existed in every atom of space.

And this is clearly the doctrine of Thomas Aquinas himself, for he says that a body "cannot be actually in many places at the same time, for this is the privilege of God only."[1] And hence he denies that the body of Christ can be, even by Divine power, locally in two places at once, and that it involves a contradiction to suppose it to be so.[2]

Bellarmine and others, however, maintain, that by Divine power the body of Christ can be at the same time locally present in many different places, though not everywhere:—an apt specimen of the unity of doctrine in the Church of Rome.

But a way has been devised by which even those who hold the views of Thomas Aquinas on this point can yet maintain that the body of Christ is present in the eucharistic elements, namely, by affirming with him (as Archdeacon Wilberforce has done) that though it is present there, it is not present *locally*;[3] and as some convenient term had to be imagined for describing this presence, it was called a *sacramental presence*,—a phrase which certainly has this advantage, that it commits its authors to no definite meaning. For to describe the nature of the presence in this sacrament by the term, a sacramental presence, is to describe *idem per idem*. And this nomenclature has been adopted by our authors, who seem also to imagine that all the world are bound to use the phrase *in the sense they attribute to*

[1] Non potest esse actu in pluribus locis simul, hoc enim solius Dei est. Thom. Aquin. In Lib. Sentent. 4. dist. 44. q. 3. ed. Venet. 1497. fol. 205.

[2] Unum corpus esse simul localiter in duobus locis non potest fieri per miraculum. Corpus enim Christi non est in altari localiter.... Quia esse in pluribus locis simul repugnat individuo, ratione ejus quod ens esse indivisum in se, sequeretur enim quod esset distinctum in situ.... Unde quod idem corpus sit localiter simul in diversis locis includit contradictionem. Id. q. 2. ib. fol. 204.

[3] Corpus Christi.... non est hic [*i. e.* in sacramento,] ut in loco per se loquendo, sed ut in sacramento, non solum significante sed continente ipsum ex vi conversionis factæ. Thom. Aquin. In Libr. Sent. iv. dist. 10. ad q. 1. ed. Venet. 1497. fol. 49. Corpus Christi non est in altari localiter. Id. ib. dist. 44. ad q. 2. ib. fol. 204.

*it*. But the phrase *sacramental presence* is more fitting to express the opposite doctrine, and has been constantly used in that sense.

Bellarmine, however, though he maintains with Thomas Aquinas that the presence of our Lord's body in the sacrament is not a *local* but a *sacramental* presence,[1] boldly affirms, that Aquinas is wrong in saying, that a body cannot be present at the same time in more places than one *locally;* and that if it cannot be so present *locally,* neither can it be so present *sacramentally*. For, the reason alleged against such a presence in the one case, namely, that it would be separated from itself, would hold good in the other, the presence being supposed to be on many different altars, *and not in the intermediate spaces*.[2]

These learned doctors of an infallible Church, therefore, can hardly complain of Protestants, if they maintain that Christ's body can neither be present *locally nor sacramentally* (if by *sacramentally* is meant *substantially*) in more than one place at the same time. For they have the authority of the "Angelical Doctor" for saying that it cannot be so present *locally,* and they agree with the Coryphæus of Roman Controversialists, that if it cannot be so present *locally,* neither can it *sacramentally*.

The evidence which Bellarmine endeavours to bring from Scripture, that Christ's body may be present in more than one place at the same time, is clearly inadequate. He urges with this view such passages as that in Acts ix., where Christ's appearance to Saul on his way to Damascus is spoken of. But such appearances may be accounted for in various ways, without our supposing that Christ's body was then both in heaven and

[1] Corpus Christi non occupat nisi unum locum ordinarie : in sacramento enim non est localiter, nisi ratione dimensionum panis. Et licet etiam localiter arbitramur posse unum corpus esse in pluribus locis.... tamen ad mysterium Eucharistiæ defendendum non requiritur, ut unum corpus possit occupare seu replere plura loca, sed satis est, si possit quocunque modo esse in pluribus locis. BELLARM. De Sacr. Euch. lib. 3. c. 3. Op. iii. 567. ed. cit.

[2] Si non posset esse unum corpus localiter in duobus locis, quia divideretur a seipso, profecto nec esse posset sacramentaliter, eadem ratione. Licet enim esse alicubi sacramentaliter, non dicat esse per loci occupationem, tamen dicit esse per realem et veram præsentiam in pluribus hostiis sive altaribus, quæ realis præsentia in tot altaribus, et non in locis intermediis, non minus tollere videretur indivisionem rei quam repletio plurium locorum. ID. ib. col. 569, 570.

at some place near the earth. For, our Lord might have been made manifest to Saul, as he was to Stephen, without any change of place in his body, and have spoken to him from heaven; and so several of the Fathers represent the matter.[1] Or he might have descended for such an occasion from heaven into some place in the regions of the air, without nullifying the Scriptural statements that the heavens were to be his abode until his future coming to judgment. And, in fact, Bellarmine himself admits, that this might be the case, and therefore that the argument is *not conclusive*.[2] And Thomas Aquinas expressly contends, that Christ's body in its proper form can only be seen *in one place*, in which he is definitively contained.[3] And Suarez, after asserting that the Body of Christ, putting aside its presence in the Eucharist, is nowhere but in heaven, goes so far as to add, that to assert the contrary is great rashness, without foundation, and in opposition to all divines.[4]

And there are various passages of Scripture which certainly *imply* in the strongest way that our Lord could not be present bodily in two places at once. Such particularly is the language of the angel at the sepulchre after his resurrection, when he said,

[1] So Pseud-Ambrose, or Hilary the Deacon, says,—Apparuit illi primum in cœlo. Comment. in 1 Cor. xv. 8. AMBROS. Op. ed. Ben. Par. tom. ii. Pt. 2. col. 161.—So, very expressly, Augustine,—Jam non invenis loqui Christum in terra: invenis illum loqui, sed de cœlo. Et de ipso cœlo quare? quia membra calcabantur in terra. Persecutori enim Saulo dixit *desuper*, Saule, Saule, quid me persequeris? Adscendi in cœlum, sed adhuc in terra jaceo: HIC *ad dexteram Patris sedeo*, ibi adhuc esurio, sitio et peregrinus sum. AUGUST. Comment. in 1 Johan. v. tract. x. § 9. Op. iii. Pt. 2. col. 655.—So Isidore of Pelusium,—ἐξ οὐρανοῦ αὐτῷ διαλέγεται. ISID. PELUS. Epist. lib. i. ep. 409. Op. ed. 1638. p. 105.—So Gregory the Great,—Persecutorem suum Saulum Dominus de cœlo prostravit, de cœlo allocutus est. GREG. MAGN. Homil. in Evang. hom. 34. § 18. Op. ed. Ben. Par. tom. ii. col. 1611.

[2] Absolute non convincit, quia non est improbabile, Christum privatim et ad breve tempus descendisse de cœlo post ascensionem. BELLARM. De Sacr. Euch. lib. 3. c. 3. col. 566.

[3] Corpus Christi non potuit in propria specie videri, nisi in uno loco; in quo definitive continetur. THOM. AQUIN. Summ. Theolog. P. 3. q. 76. art. 8. ed. Paris. 1631. p. 200.

[4] Concludo Christi corpus tantum esse in cœlo et in Eucharistia; seclusoque eodem Eucharistiæ mysterio, non solum non esse corpus Christi ubique, sed neque etiam esse alibi quam in cœlo: et contrarium asserere esset magna temeritas sine fundamento, et contra omnes theologos. SUAREZ. Comm. in Thom. quæst. 14. art. 4. disp. 32. § 4. Tom. i. p. 532. ed. Mogunt. 1617. fol.

"He is not here, FOR he is risen."[1] The words clearly imply that the fact of his resurrection proved that he could not be there.

So our Lord himself says to his disciples, "Lazarus is dead, and I am glad for your sakes that I was not there."[2]

Various other examples might be added.

(iii.) It involves the self-contradiction that a body remaining a body, should nevertheless be without any of those properties that are the distinguishing characteristics of a body, that is, be a body and yet not a body, but a spirit, at one and the same time.

This is another self-contradiction which ought not to be left unnoticed. It would not, indeed, suffice to prove the truth of the doctrine under consideration, even if it was left unquestioned, for it would not prove a capacity of multipresence. But it illustrates the unsoundness of the views here opposed.

That a body should have certain dimensions and extension is essential to its being a body. And it cannot have finite dimensions and extension without being *quantitative* and *local*. As Bishop Jeremy Taylor says, "When we speak of a *body*, all the world means that which hath a *finite* quantity, and is determined to *one place*."[3] To say, therefore, that a body has no dimensions and no local presence, is to say that it is *not a body*. Now doubtless the Almighty power of God can change a body from being a body to be something else. But to assert that a body remaining a body can at the same time, through Divine power, be *not a body*, is not to ascribe omnipotence to God, but to derogate from the perfection of his nature by ascribing to him self-contradictions.

And I would ask Archdeacon Wilberforce, why he thinks it so necessary to maintain that our Lord's body has in heaven a certain form, place, and dimensions, but that he is conscious that these are essential properties of a body? And if these are essential properties of a body, that which lacks them cannot be a true body.

This doctrine is, in truth, much more absurd than that of the

[1] Οὐκ ἐστιν ὧδε· ἠγέρθη γὰρ. Matt. xxviii. 6. And the words in Luke are not very different, being ἀλλ' ἠγέρθη. Luke xxiv. 6.

[2] John xi. 14, 15.

[3] Real Presence &c. Sect. xi. 13. ed. 1654. p. 212. See p. 51 above.

antient heretics, the Marcionites, Manichees, and others, who held that Christ's body was only in appearance a material body, but was in reality immaterial and like a spirit. For even this is less irrational than supposing that Christ has *two* bodies, one material and the other like a spirit. But here lies the difficulty with our authors. The material body they *must* admit, to escape the direct condemnation not only of Scripture, but the Fathers too. The immaterial body they need for their doctrine on the Eucharist, which would at once fall to the ground without it. And thus to accomplish both purposes they plead for both, calling them different *forms* of the same body; as if one and the same body could at the same time possess characteristics, the negatives of one another, and be whole and entire in millions of different places, separate from one another.

Our authors have the temerity to speak as if the great divines of our Church favored such views. I have already given the reader some evidence of the nature of this representation as applied to Hooker and Jeremy Taylor.[1] And a more appropriate place for full evidence on this point will occur hereafter, in the chapter appropriated to the testimony of English divines. But it may be well to give the reader at once a few more passages from some of our great divines on the subject.

Thus speaks Bishop Jewel:—

"Over all this M. Harding throweth a sweet mist, to carry away the simple in the dark: Christ's body, saith he, is in the sacrament, not by local, but by substantial presence; carnally, but not in carnal manner; placed in the pix, in the hand, in the mouth, and yet in no place at all; a very natural body, even as it was upon the cross, yet without all manner quantity and dimensions or proportions of a body, that is, neither thick, nor broad, nor short, nor long; there now where before it was not, and yet without any shifting or change of places. [This is an accurate description of the doctrine of our authors as fully described by Archdeacon Wilberforce.] UNLESS THIS MAN WERE FAST ASLEEP, HE COULD NEVER FALL INTO SO DEEP A DREAM. In these fantasies he seemeth well to agree with the old heretics Eutyches and Manichee. For even such a body they imagined that Christ received of the blessed Virgin; and yet were they heretics notwithstanding. For, which of all the old learned Fathers ever taught us this strange doctrine? Who ever

[1] See pp. 50, 51, above.

durst so spoil Christ of his place, of his quantity, and of the natural proportions of his body? . . . . M. Harding, to maintain his errors, and to avoid infinite absurdities, is driven to say, There are *two Christs;* the one local, the other not local; the one above, the other beneath; the one with proportion of body, the other without proportion."[1]

"Thus therefore reason they: . . . . . Christ hath two sorts of bodies: one only local; all the rest of the other sort not local. It is in place, yet it occupieth or filleth no place. It is a very natural man's body; yet is it neither round, nor square, nor thick, nor broad, nor short, nor long. It hath in it no distance or difference of parts, as between eye and eye, or eye and ear, or head and foot; but eye, ear, arm, hand, heel, toe, head, and foot are all together, and each is other, and all is one. In ten thousand several places Christ's body is full and whole; and yet all these are but one body. Thus, *one is many, and many are one: above is beneath, and beneath is above: local is not local, and not local is local;* and all this without the authority either of God's holy word, or of any one old catholic Father. These be M. Harding's catholic conclusions; *even the very same that were used and avouched by Eutyches, Apollinarius, Manichæus, and other like heretics in old times.*"[2]

Thus also speaks another eminent Bishop of our Church, who is very confidently referred to by Dr. Pusey and his party as maintaining their views,—I mean Bishop Cosin:—

Christ "did not say that he gave his disciples a fantastic body—such a visionary figment as Marcion believed—but that very body which was given for us, WITHOUT BEING DEPRIVED OF THAT EXTENSION AND OTHER ACCIDENTS OF HUMAN BODIES, WITHOUT WHICH IT COULD NOT HAVE BEEN CRUCIFIED. Since the maintainers of transubstantiation [and our authors also, whatever they may call their doctrine] grant, that the body of Christ keeps its quantity in heaven, and say it is without the same in the sacrament, *they must either acknowledge their contradiction in the matter, or give over their opinion.*"[3]

Another testimony shall be from our learned Bishop Stillingfleet. He fixes upon the imaginary multipresence of Christ's body as *the great absurdity* in the doctrine of Transubstantiation, and thus he reasons on the subject in his Dialogue between a

[1] JEWEL'S Reply to Harding's Answer. Art. 6. Wks. P. S. ed. vol. i. pp. 483, 484.

[2] ID. ib. pp. 495, 496.

[3] COSIN'S Hist. of Transubst. ed. 1840. pp. 58, 59.

Protestant and a Papist, entitled, "The Doctrine of the Trinity and Transubstantiation compared."

"*P.* You have taken a great deal of pains to clear the doctrine of the Trinity from any absurdity in point of reason; why should you not do as much now as to transubstantiation?

"*Pr.* In plain truth, because I cannot; for here lies a vast difference between them. In the Trinity we considered an infinite Being, to which no bounds can be set without destroying its nature; but in transubstantiation we suppose *a true finite body, which hath its natural bounds and limits to one certain place, and yet you will and must suppose this body to be equally present in many thousand distant places at the same time; which implies so great a repugnancy to the very nature of a body, that I can by no means give my assent to it.*

"*P.* Alas! Is this it which chokes your reason, so that you cannot swallow the doctrine of the Church in this matter? You do not consider, that though we allow nothing infinite in the body itself, yet we suppose an infinite power to be employed about it; and an infinite power may produce things above our comprehensions about bodies in themselves finite.

"*Pr.* This is the utmost your cause will bear; but I pray, tell me, is there any such thing as a repugnancy in the nature of things, or not? *i. e.*, Are there not some things which are endued with such properties, that if you alter them, you destroy their very nature; as, to suppose an indivisible line, a triangle without lines, *a body without dimensions?*

"*P.* Hold a little; a body must have dimensions belonging to it, but it is not necessary it should have those dimensions wherever it is present. For it may be present in one place as a body, and in another *after the manner of a spirit.*

"*Pr. You might as well have said, a body may be considered two ways; as it is a body, and as it is not a body; for there can be no body where there are no dimensions proper to it.*

"*P.* See how you are mistaken; for 'it is not the dimensions which seem to hinder a body being in more places at once, but its unity;' as Bellarmine well observes.

"*Pr.* I say both of them hinder. For a true body can no more be without its dimensions, than a line without divisibility.

"*P.* I grant that naturally it cannot, but by Divine power it may.

"*Pr.* Will you make the power of God to change the essential properties of things, while the things themselves remain in their true nature? You may as well say, that naturally man is a reasonable creature, but by Divine power he may be a true man, and

yet want the faculty of reasoning : that naturally two and two make four, but God can make two and two to be joined together *in a supernatural manner*, so that four shall not result from them ; that though, naturally speaking, whitewashing a wall makes it look white, yet by an extraordinary power, there may be the presence of all things which make a wall white, yet it shall not do so ; *just so it is to make a body present, and yet to have no dimensions of a body.* Is there any real difference between the nature of a body and spirit ? Wherein lies it ? *Is it not as repugnant for a body to be after the manner of a spirit, as for a body and spirit to be the same ?*

" *P.* All this proceeds upon not considering the difference between the *essential extension* of a body, and that which is *quantitative, and hath relation to place.*

" *Pr.* The *essential extension* of a body without *quantity* is nonsense, and a contradiction. For it is to make a body extended and not extended at the same time. I pray tell me what you mean by *a body*, as it is opposed to *a spirit ?*

" *P.* I mean as all mankind do, such a substance which consists of parts extended and divisible.

" *Pr.* Then, being extended and divisible, are the natural and essential properties of a body. And therefore, to suppose a body not to be extended and divisible, is to suppose it not to be a body ; which is a plain contradiction.

" *P.* You are to distinguish between the *intrinsecal quantity*, which is an inseparable property of a body, and the *extrinsecal relation* it hath to a place.

" *Pr. Intrinsecal quantity* without relation to place, is *intrinsecal nonsense.* For how is it possible for extended parts to have no relation to place ?

" *P.* By *relation to place*, I mean, when the parts of a body answer to the parts of a place ; but by *intrinsecal quantity*, I mean, that there is the real order and proportion of parts in the body itself, but it doth not fill up the place.

" *Pr.* Then you do suppose the body of Christ in the Eucharist to have all the distinct parts of a body, with their due order and proportion, but to be in the Sacrament after an invisible manner ?

" *P.* Why not ?

" *Pr.* Do you think it possible for the real and entire body of a man to be crowded into the compass of a wafer, with all the difference of its parts, so that no true part of the body be missing ?

" *P.* Yes, by Divine power.

" *Pr.* Do you think a far less thing possible than that, viz., that a man's head and shoulders and arms should be contained entire and distinct under the nail of his little finger ?

"*P.* Why not?

"*Pr.* Then why may not the greatest body be within the least? Why may not an elephant be caught in a mousetrap, and a rhinoceros be put into a snuff-box? For either there is a repugnancy in the nature of the thing, for a greater body to be within a less, or there is not: if not, then these mentioned instances are possible; if there be, then the supposition of Divine power can give no relief, unless you suppose that God can do things repugnant in themselves, *i. e.*, that he can do things which cannot be done. But I pray tell me, if the very body of Christ be by transubstantiation in the wafer [or, we may add, in or under the form of the bread, in any way] with all its parts in their due order, then the head must be distant from the feet, and all the other organs in their proper places; but this cannot possibly be supposed, where there is no measure of distance as place is, and the whole body is in a point.

"*P.* I say again, there is a just order of parts considered *in themselves*, but not *with respect to place.*

"*Pr.* Then, it is impossible there should be any distance; without which it is impossible there should be the order of parts in a human body. Thus, there is a repugnancy in the very supposition of Christ's body being in the wafer, though there were but one single wafer; but when to this we add, that it is equally thus present in thousands of wafers, at what distance of place soever, the absurdities do increase and multiply so fast upon us that it is hardly possible to imagine anything concerning a body, which doth imply more than this doth. As that one and the same body should be indivisibly present in many places, where it must be divided from itself, by so many bodies interposing; so that it is impossible to apprehend how two bodies can be divided from one another more effectually, than such a body must be from itself, if it be present in many places at once.

"*P.* I pray stop here; for reckon up as many absurdities as you will, they are all but the effects of *carnal reason*, and we must *captivate our understanding to the obedience of faith.*

"*Pr.* Then it is to no purpose to argue any farther on the point of reason." [1]

I must add also a few more extracts from Bishop Taylor, in order to meet a reference of Archdeacon Wilberforce, which is certainly one of the most painful specimens of disingenuous quotation that I have ever met with. Out of a treatise of Bishop Taylor's, which contains the most full and elaborate refutation

[1] Bishop Stillingfleet's Doctrine of the Trinity and Transubstantiation compared &c. Lond. 1687. 4to, Part 2. pp. 33—37.

of the Archdeacon's whole system of doctrine on this subject,[1] the Archdeacon[2] extracts a few words, ambiguous when standing alone, for the purpose of making the Bishop a witness for the doctrine of the body of Christ being in the eucharistic elements in the way he imagines—a doctrine to the *refutation* of which Bishop Taylor devotes a considerable portion of his treatise, his great argument against the doctrine of Transubstantiation being the absurdity of supposing that the body of Christ can be present in an immaterial form, like a spirit, and be in various places at the same time.[3] First, he shows, in the passage already quoted,[4] that a body, remaining a body, cannot be imagined to be present anywhere like a spirit. Then he proceeds to prove that all bodies, and Christ's body among them, must be in some one definite place;[5] and having observed that there are but three ways of being in a place, namely, *circumscriptive*, *definitive*, and *repletive*, and that Christ's body can be in the sacrament in none of these, he adds,—

"But now *a fourth word must be invented*, and that is *sacramentaliter*. Christ's body is *sacramentally* in more places than one: which is very true, *that is, the sacrament of Christ's body is:* and so is his Body, FIGURATIVELY, TROPICALLY, REPRESENTATIVELY IN BEING, and *really in effect and blessing*. But this is *not* a natural, *real being in a place*, but a relation to a person; the other three are all the manners of location which the soul of man could yet ever apprehend."[6]

Such is Bishop Taylor's mode of dealing with such a notion of a "*sacramental* presence," as that advocated by our authors.

But he goes on to show, that "in a body there cannot be "indistinction of parts, but each must possess his own portion "of place; and if it does not, a body cannot be a body, nor "distinguished from a spirit."[7] And on Aquinas's distinction, that the body of Christ is in the Sacrament not in the manner of a body, but of a spirit, (which is exactly Archdeacon Wilberforce's doctrine) he remarks, among other things, that if it is there, "according to the nature of an immaterial substance, then

[1] The Real Presence and Spiritual of Christ in the Blessed Sacrament. 1654. 8vo.
[2] pp. 91, 92. 3rd ed. p. 78.
[3] See nearly the whole of sect. xi. of his treatise.
[4] p. 51 above.
[5] Sect. xi. §§ 15—17, pp. 215 et seq.
[6] Sect. xi. § 17. p. 218.
[7] Sect. xi. § 18. pp. 219, 220.

"it is not a body, but a spirit; or else the body may have the "being of a spirit whilst it remains a body, that is, be a body "and not a body at the same time." But, he adds, "Aquinas "hath yet another device to make all whole, saying that one "body cannot be in diverse places *localiter*, but *sacramentaliter*, "not *locally*, but *sacramentally* [which is exactly the 'device' "of our authors]. But first I wish the words were sense, and "that I could tell the meaning of being in a place *locally*, and "*not locally*, unless a thing can be in a place, and not in a place, "that is, so to be *in*, that it is also *out*: but so long as it is a "distinction it is no matter, it will amuse and make way to "escape, if it will do nothing else. But if by being *sacramen-* "*tally* in many places is meant FIGURATIVELY (as before I "explicated it), then I grant Aquinas's affirmative; Christ's "body is in many places *sacramentally*, that is, it is REPRE- "SENTED upon all the holy Tables or Altars in the Christian "Church."[1]

"How is it possible that Christ's body should be in heaven, and between it and us are many other bodies interposed, and his body is in none of the intermedials, and that his body should be also here, and yet not joined to that, either by continuity or contiguity, and the same body should be a thousand miles off, and ten thousand bodies between them, and yet all this be but one: that is, How can it be two, and yet be one? For how shall any man reckon two? How can he know that two glasses of wine are not one? We see them in two places, their continuity divided, there is an intermedial distance and other bodies interposed, and therefore we silly men usually say they are two; but it is strange to see a man may be confident, and yet without reason, when he hath not wit enough to tell two. But then there is not in nature any way for a man to tell two, if this principle be taken from us. It will also be an infinite impossible contradiction which follows the being of a body in two places at once; upon this account. For it will infer that the same body is at the same time, in the same respect, in order to the same place, both actually and potentially, that is, possessed and not possessed of it, and may go to that place where it is already."[2]

And he proceeds at considerable length to vindicate this doctrine against Bellarmine's sophisms.

He then shows how this notion of the body of Christ being

[1] Sect. xi. § 21. pp. 222, 223.

[2] Sect. xi. § 22. pp. 224, 225.

in several places simultaneously takes away the Patristical argument for the divinity of the Holy Spirit from his ubiquity; for, as he justly argues,—

"That which can be in many places, can be in all places; for all the reason that forbids it to be in two thousand forbids it to be in two; and if *those* cannot determine it to one place, it cannot be determined at all; I mean, the nature of a body, his determination to places, his circumscription, continuity, unity, quantity, dimensions. Nay, that which is not determined by place, by continuity, nor by his nature, but may be anywhere, is in his own nature *uncircumscribed*, and *indefinite*, which is that attribute of God upon which his omnipresence does rely; and that Christ's body is not everywhere actually, as is the Holy Ghost, it says nothing against this; because he being a voluntary agent can restrain the measure of his presence, as God himself does the many manners of his presence. However, that nature is infinite that can be everywhere, and therefore if it can be communicated to a body, to be so, is not proper to God, nor can it prove the Holy Ghost so to be." [1]

He therefore wholly repudiates the distinction of Christ's body having "capacities of presence," by which it may be in many different places, while nevertheless it cannot be in *all* places.

"Of the same nature," he adds, "is that other argument "used frequently by the primitive doctors, proving two natures "to be in Christ, the Divine and the human; and the difference "between them is remarked in this, that the Divine is *in many* "*places*, and *in all*; but the human can be but in one at once." And he refers to several of the Fathers in proof of this argument being used by them.[2]

He then answers various arguments that have been alleged by the Romanists on this subject, particularly that from the supposed transit of our Lord's body through the unopened tomb and the closed doors of the room where the disciples were assembled,[3] *denying that we have any reason to suppose that our Lord's body passed through the stone and the door in the way supposed;* and on the argument from the Divine omnipotence, he justly remarks;—

[1] Sect. xi. § 24. pp. 231, 232.
[2] Ibid. p. 232.
[3] Sect. xi. § 32. pp. 246—9.

"God can do what he pleases, and he can reverse the laws of his whole creation, because he can change or annihilate every creature, or alter the manners and essences; but the question now is, what laws God hath already established, and whether or no essentials can be changed, the things remaining the same? that is, whether they can be the same, when they are not the same? He that says God can give to a body all the essential properties of a spirit, says true, and confesses God's omnipotency; but he says also, that God can change a body from being a body to become a spirit; but if he says, that remaining a body it can receive the essentials of a spirit, he does not confess God's omnipotency, but makes the article difficult to be believed, by making it not to work wisely and possibly. God can do all things, but are they undone when they are done? that is, are the things changed in their essentials, and yet remain the same? Then how are they changed, and then what hath God done to them?"[1]

And yet notwithstanding all this, and that the rest of the Treatise is at least equally decided in its opposition to such views as those of our authors, Bishop Taylor is put forward as having, in this very Treatise, supported them![2] It is difficult to understand how such statements can be ventured upon.

This point has also been largely discussed by Bishops Bilson[3] and Morton,[4] two of the most able and learned prelates our Church has ever produced, and both of them have in the most full and elaborate way refuted the doctrine maintained by our authors respecting it, pointing out that doctrine as *the great error* involved in the doctrine of Transubstantiation. Both, nevertheless, I regret to say for the honor of our Church, have been cited by Tractarian writers as supporters of their views.

Having thus endeavoured to dispose of the question of the *possibility* of such a presence of Christ's body and blood as is contended for, I hope it is not necessary to discuss at any length the argument of Archdeacon Wilberforce for its *probability*. That the gifts of grace are anywhere spoken of in the

[1] Sect. xi. § 30. pp. 244, 5.

[2] See not only the reference of Archdeacon Wilberforce mentioned above, but the Catena of passages from English Divines, just published at Oxford, intitled, "The Doctrine of the Real Presence," &c. 1855. 8vo.

[3] In his "Difference between Christian Subjection and Unchristian Rebellion." See the extracts in Chapter VII. below, on the Doctrine of the English Divines.

[4] In his "Institution of the Sacrament," &c., and "Decisio Controversiæ," &c. See extracts in Chap. VII. below.

New Testament as coming to us through the oral reception of our Blessed Lord's flesh and blood, I have yet to learn; and not one tittle of evidence has the Archdeacon produced on the point. Confidently as the Archdeacon talks about "the statements of Scripture respecting grace" bearing out his views, he gives us nothing more definite than that "grace is never spoken of in the Gospels, except as associated with the humanity of God the Son." Now, certainly it may well be, that the mention of grace is always, directly or indirectly, connected with the *incarnation* of God the Son, because all grace has come to us through our Blessed Lord's incarnation. But that grace comes to us through our Lord's human body being orally eaten and swallowed by us, is a notion—I will not say merely *unsupported* by this or any Scriptural statement, but — so utterly repugnant to the testimony of God's word, and withal so grovelling and debasing to the mind to contemplate, that I am unwilling to dwell further upon it.

(3.) This doctrine supposes the living Saviour, God and man in one person, to be, whole and entire, in every morsel of the consecrated bread, and with a presence multiplied according to the number of the fragments into which any one may break the bread, and to pass into the mouth and stomach of every communicant.

"Whatsoever was meant," says Archdeacon Wilberforce, "by the giving the Body and the Blood of Christ, as by the "force of the terms it implied the gift of his Manhood, so *by "virtue of the Hypostatic union it involved that of His Godhead "also* . . . . When our Lord, then, spoke of his Body and "Blood as bestowed upon his disciples in this sacrament, He "must have been understood to imply, that He Himself, *God-"head, Soul and Body,* was the gift communicated."[1]

And no doubt, "by virtue of the Hypostatic union," as Archdeacon Wilberforce says, his body, wherever it is, must be united to the second Person of the Sacred Trinity. And therefore Archdeacon Denison *must, of necessity,* hold the same view.

So that in, or with, or under the form of every portion of the consecrated elements, the living Saviour, "*Godhead, Soul*

[1] p. 91, or 3rd ed. p. 78.

*and Body,*" passes into the mouth and stomach of every communicant, be he even the most wicked man upon earth. And the living Saviour, Godhead, Soul and Body, whole Christ, is in, or with, or under the form of every atom into which the consecrated bread is divided, present whole and entire, not locally, or as occupying space, but yet so as to be swallowed by the mouth.[1]

Now, of such a doctrine it is painful even to speak. The very thought of it is appalling. And when we come to investigate all the absurdities which it involves, it seems almost incredible that it should ever have met with any real credence from reasonable men.

For instance, the human body of Christ must have its various parts and proportions. The head cannot be precisely where the foot is. And therefore there must be some local extension. The former position Bellarmine admits, confessing that the body of Christ in this sacrament must have magnitude, and therefore extension of parts, *in itself* (*in se*); but he denies this extension with reference to *place*;[2] drawing a distinction between the internal position of the parts in the subject, and their position with reference to place, contending that they may co-exist so far as place is concerned, but not as considered with regard to the subject in which they exist; which he admits, however, to be exceedingly difficult to understand, "on account of the weakness of the human understanding."[3]

But he is here availing himself of "the weakness of the human understanding" for his own purposes. And it is admitted by himself and other Romanists, that some of their own most able and acute divines expressly deny the possibility of this, and therefore deny that the body of Christ has any quantity or magnitude as it exists in the eucharistic elements.[4] And surely it needs no argument to prove, that such a distinc-

[1] Dr. Pusey's notion is, that the body of Christ is in the bread by interpenetration, without displacement, just as Christ's body, passing through the closed doors (as he maintains) was, at one moment, "in the same place, penetrating, but not displacing them." (p. 23.)

[2] Bellarmine, De Euch. lib. iii. cc. 5, 6, 7.

[3] Id. ibid. c. 7. Op. tom. iii. col. 588, 589.

[4] Id. ib. c. 5. Maldonat. De Euchar. c. 8. Suarez. in Thom. tom. 3. quæst. 75. art. 2. disp. 52. § 3. ed. Ven. 1597. pp. 652, 653.

tion is utterly untenable. That which is extended in itself according to the proportion of its parts, must be extended as it regards place or space.

But if this be so, how can the body of Christ exist whole and entire in all its parts and proportions, in or under the form of every atom into which the consecrated bread may be divided?

Again, as it is maintained that our Lord's body, whole and entire, is in or with every fragment into which the bread is divided, if the priest says over a piece of bread, "This is my body," and afterwards breaks the bread into a dozen pieces, then, according to this doctrine, that which was by consecration *one* body of Christ suddenly becomes multiplied by the mere act of breaking the bread into *a dozen* bodies, and yet nevertheless those dozen bodies are all one and the self-same body; and the body of Christ, though so united to the bread, or form of bread, as to be necessarily eaten with it by every one who eats the bread, is nevertheless not broken when the bread is broken, or divided into parts as the bread is divided, but is whole and entire in every fragment.

Nay more, it would appear as if the communicant could multiply the body of Christ as well as the priest. For if he breaks into fragments the piece of bread given to him, he obtains as many bodies of Christ as there are fragments.

And as to the reception of the Body of Christ into the mouth and stomach—but I confess I feel an unconquerable reluctance to pursue this point any further. The mind revolts from the further consideration of a doctrine so dissonant from the pure and spiritual nature of the Christian faith. I dare not give a place in these pages to a notice of the questions discussed by Roman Catholic writers in connexion with this part of the subject, however much it might serve to make manifest some of the consequences resulting from the admission of this doctrine.

Without adverting, however, to these points, there is one question which I may be permitted to ask, which is this,—If the body of Christ is received into the body of every communicant, and is not (as seems to be admitted by Archdeacon Wilberforce) absorbed into the communicant's body, what becomes of it? And if we calculate the number of communicants that have existed since the commencement of the Chris-

tian era, what limit can we place to the number of bodies so to be accounted for, unless we are disposed to stop the voice of reason, and set them all down as one and the same with the one material body of Christ in heaven?

This difficulty has driven the Romanists in all directions to seek for a solution, and their replies are literally as wide apart as heaven and earth. For the Gloss on the Canon Law tells us, that "it is certain that as soon as the forms [in the eucharistic elements] are ground by the teeth, immediately the body of Christ is snatched up into heaven."[1] But according to the hypothesis, the *same* body is already there, and in a material form. And still the question recurs, What becomes of it?

Thomas Aquinas tried his hand on the same difficulty, and solves it in a precisely opposite way. He determines that the body of Christ remains as long as the forms remain, and is not then taken up to heaven, from which it never came.[2] But he does not tell us what becomes of it.

What precise view the authors under consideration take on this point, I will not pretend to say. Their language certainly implies the notion, that the body of Christ is *swallowed* as well as *put into the mouth*, and therefore I have so dealt with it. But if they prefer the view maintained in the Gloss on the Canon Law, or any similar notion, be it so. I would only remind them, that none of the difficulties I have advanced against their doctrine are thereby removed.

But I must proceed to show, how the maintainers of the doctrine in question, having carried their notion of the bodily presence thus far, find themselves compelled suddenly to stop short, and make their supposed oral manducation of the Body of Christ *utterly vain and useless*. If there is, as the authors under review earnestly contend, a bodily reception of Christ's body, the object of such reception would naturally appear to be, that what is thus received into the mouth and stomach (as is supposed) should be so received for the purpose of nourishing the body; or, at any rate, that it should *act in some way* upon

[1] Certum est, quod species quam cito dentibus teruntur, tam cito in cœlum rapitur corpus Christi. DECRET. GRAT. Pt. 3. De Consecr. dist. 2. c. 23. Gloss. See Corp. Jur. Canon. Lugd. 1624. tom. 1. col. 1922.

[2] See note ibid.

the body. But here insuperable difficulties present themselves, and accordingly we find in their own statements another objection to the doctrine in question. For their own admissions show, that,—

(4.) The supposed bodily manducation of Christ's body is *utterly useless and unprofitable.*

Thus speaks Archdeacon Wilberforce:—

"The process by which Christ's Body and Blood act upon the receiver is spiritual, and not physical." [1] . . . . " 'The Body of Christ is the food, not of the belly, but of the mind; of the soul, and not the body.' And therefore the benefit of this sacrament *cannot be obtained without faith;* seeing that it is only through faith that the inward part, or *res sacramenti*, can be apprehended by the mind." . . . . "Faith is essential if the *res sacramenti* is to be the spiritual nourishment of the soul." [2] . . . . "The Body of Christ, which we receive in this sacrament, is a renewed and renewing example of our common humanity; but it *does not, and cannot, act directly upon our material structure*, seeing that its Presence is not that natural Presence which would be an object to the senses, or supply nourishment to our bodily frame. Although we may pray, therefore, 'that our sinful bodies may be made clean by his Body,' as well as 'our souls washed by his most precious blood,' yet it is *only through a spiritual process that this work can be effected, and its medium must be a believing heart.*" [3]

So that even supposing the communicant to be a true believer, the oral reception of Christ's Body is altogether useless. It leads to nothing. It answers no conceivable end or purpose. It is not like a thing of which it can be said, God has ordained it as a means to a certain end, and therefore, however inefficient it may appear to us to be, it is sufficient, through God's ordinance, to answer that end. For the statements of the Archdeacon involve the admission, that it is not a means to produce the desired end. The Body of Christ, it is admitted, though received into the mouth and stomach, is not intended or calculated to produce any effect upon the receiver through that reception. It is faith only that can feed upon it, or make it answer any purpose. The communicant, therefore, is placed in no better position for any spiritual and profitable feeding on

[1] pp. 404, 405. 3rd ed. p. 348. [2] pp. 405, 406, 3rd ed. pp. 349, 350.
[3] p. 407, 3rd ed. p. 350.

Christ by eating and swallowing Christ's Body, for by the Archdeacon's own confession (forced from him by the express statements of the Fathers) it does not act upon the body, and the soul feeds upon Christ's body by *faith*, which cannot be helped by an imaginary invisible oral reception of that body.

The Archdeacon asks,—"If it be affirmed that the soul "cannot be a channel through which the gift of Christ's pre- "sence in the Holy Eucharist can affect and modify the whole "body, how comes it that a man's own body can produce such "effects upon his soul?"[1] But this is leading us away from the question. The question is, not whether the body cannot be affected through the soul, but *whether that which is food only for the soul, and cannot act in any way directly upon the body, becomes food for the soul by being received into the body*. It may be fully admitted, that the body and the soul act upon one another. But this does not touch the point in question. The body may no doubt act upon the soul, and the soul upon the body, but the reception of anything by the body, which cannot act upon the body, or produce any effect upon it, or be used by it in any way, cannot enable the body to produce any effect upon the soul. And it is confessed by the Archdeacon, that the soul feeds upon Christ's body *by faith*, and that Christ's body is food for the soul only, not acting in any way upon the body, though supposed to be received into it. In what respect, then, is faith better able to feed upon the body of Christ when present in the mouth or stomach, than if it was at the right hand of God? Is it seen, or felt, or does it become the object of any one of the senses? No, nothing of this kind is supposed by any one. How, therefore, can this oral reception be any help to faith? It does not tend to *excite* faith any more than the reception of the sacred *symbol* of Christ's body; particularly as it is to the body and blood of Christ *as suffering upon the Cross* 1800 *years ago* to which our faith is to be directed, and not to the body and blood of the Saviour as now glorified, lying (as it is affirmed) in our mouths or stomachs.

It is not even *present* to faith more by being supposed to be in the stomach, than if it remained in heaven. In both cases it is admitted to be invisible, and not the object of any one of

[1] pp. 412, 413, 3rd ed. p. 355.

the senses. A difference of locality, therefore, makes no difference in its presence to faith. It is as much present to faith, for faith to feed upon, supposing it to remain at the right hand of God in heaven, as it would be if lying invisibly and insensibly in the mouth or stomach.

The following remarks of Bishop Jeremy Taylor on the doctrine of Transubstantiation are as closely applicable to the doctrine we are now considering as to that of which they were spoken.

"Let me observe this," says Bishop Taylor, "that the doctrine of Transubstantiation is *infinitely useless and to no purpose.* For by the words of our Blessed Lord, by the doctrine of St. Paul, and the sense of the Church, and the confession of all sides, the natural eating of Christ's flesh (if it were there, or could so be eaten) alone or of itself does no good, does not give life, but *the spiritual eating of him is the instrument of life to us;* and this may be done without their transubstantiated flesh; [and of course equally without any oral reception of Christ's flesh in any form] it may be done in Baptism, by faith and charity, by hearing and understanding, and therefore it may also in the Blessed Eucharist, *although there also, according to our doctrine, he be eaten* ONLY SACRAMENTALLY AND SPIRITUALLY. . . . . Add to this, that this bodily presence of Christ's body is either for *corporal* nourishment or for *spiritual.* Not for *corporal;* for natural food is more proper for it; and to work a miracle to do that for which so many natural means are already appointed, is to no purpose, and therefore cannot be supposed to be done by God: neither is it done for *spiritual* nourishment, because *to the spiritual nourishment,* virtues and graces, the word and *the efficacious* SIGNS, faith and the inward actions, and all the emanations of the Spirit, are as proportioned as meat and drink are to natural nourishment; and therefore there can be no need of a corporal presence." [1]

"He that receives unworthily receives no benefit to his body or to his soul by the holy sacrament; this is agreed on all sides; therefore he that receives benefit to his body receives it by his worthy communicating, therefore the benefit reaching to the body by the Holy Eucharist comes to it *by the soul,* therefore *by the action of the soul, not the action of the body;* therefore *by faith, not by the mouth:* whereas on the contrary, if Christ's body natural were eaten in the Sacrament, the benefit would come to the body *by his own action, and to the soul by the body* . . . . As is the

[1] Bp. J. TAYLOR, Real Presence, &c. ed. 1654. Sect. 3. § 9. pp. 46—48.

nutriment, so is the manducation. If the nourishment be wholly spiritual, then *so is the eating*. But by the Roman doctrine the body of Christ does not naturally nourish, therefore neither is it *eaten naturally;* but it does nourish spiritually, and therefore it is *eaten only spiritually. . . . . If it be absurd to say Christ's body doth nourish corporally, why it should not be as absurd to say, we eat it corporally, is a secret which I have not yet been taught.*" [1]

(5.) This doctrine is inconsistent with the necessary union of the body and blood in the living Saviour.

If the body and blood of Christ are so present in, with, or under the forms of, the bread and wine as to come into the mouths of the communicants, whether it be by transubstantiation or consubstantiation, or any other way, they must be the body and blood of Christ as now *living*. They cannot be literally the body broken and the blood shed 1800 years ago upon the Cross. For though the body and blood of the living Saviour are the same essentially as the body and blood that suffered upon the Cross, yet they are changed in state and condition, and they must be present in the condition in which they now are. Now, being a *living* body, to say nothing on the question of motion, thus much at least is clear, that where the *body* is, there the *blood* must be. Accordingly the Romanists maintain, that—

"The body itself is under the species of wine, and the blood under the species of bread, and the soul under each, by virtue of that natural connection and concomitance, by which the parts of Christ our Lord, who, being now risen from the dead, can die no more, are naturally joined together . . . . as much is contained under either species as under both: for Christ, whole and entire, exists under the species of bread, and under each particle of that species; and whole under the species of wine, and under its parts." [2]

And this doctrine of concomitance, as it is called, is expressly maintained by Archdeacon Wilberforce,[3] and from it he deduces, like the Romanists, the lawfulness of the practice of the communion under one kind.[4]

[1] Id. ibid. Sect. vii. § 8. pp. 131, 132. [2] Concil. Trid. Sess. xiii. c. 3.

[3] Doct. of Holy Euch. p. 82, or 3rd ed. p. 70.

[4] For a reply to this doctrine and that which follows from it, see Jewel's Reply to Harding, Art. 2, where he calls Harding's statement that "under either kind whole Christ is verily present," Harding's "forty-sixth untruth."

Now if the body of Christ as now living were present in or with or under the form of the bread, so as to be eaten with it, it would be undeniable, that he who partook of the bread, would necessarily partake of the *blood* of Christ's body, as being inseparably connected with it.

But then, what becomes of our Lord's words, that the wine is his blood, and is to be partaken of, as the Apostle tells us, to bring us into communion with Christ's blood? Such a doctrine as that we have just been considering leaves these words destitute of meaning. If the Apostles partook of the blood of Christ when eating the *bread* of the Lord's Supper, our Lord would clearly not have followed up the distribution of the bread by giving them wine, with the words, "Drink ye all of this, for this is my blood," &c., for they would have been receiving his blood the moment before.

And this doctrine makes the consecration of the wine altogether useless and without purpose. For if, when the words, "This is my body," are uttered over the bread, the body of Christ, necessarily including his blood, is truly present, there is no occasion for any consecration of wine. The blood of Christ is *already present* in or with or under the form of the bread. There is literally no object in the consecration of the wine. The sacrament is as complete without it as with it, and there is no reason why it should ever be used. But in what light does this fact place the doctrine in question?

Supposing the bread and wine to be *symbolical representations* of our Lord's *flesh* and *blood*, intended as *instruments* to bring us, through their proper use, into communion with Christ, and make us partakers of all the benefits of his crucified flesh and shed blood, all is clear and plain; but if you make the living body of Christ present in the bread, you reduce the second part of this holy sacrament to an absurdity.

But by those who hold (confessedly or not, I will not now stop to inquire) the doctrine of Consubstantiation, this doctrine of Concomitance seems to be generally denied. What may be the case with Dr. Pusey and Archdeacon Denison, I will not venture to say, as they have not themselves, I believe, touched upon the point. But of the way in which the difficulty is met by others, Chemnitius and Gerhard may serve as examples.

That it is a serious difficulty, is obvious, because if the living body of Christ as now existent is present in the bread, the blood must be present with that living body. Let it be supposed, as asserted, that the body is present after some supernatural, celestial, indescribable manner; still if it is Christ's living body, the flesh and blood must go together, and be present together in this indescribable form.

But it seems, that as they have resolved that the words of institution must be taken in what they call the literal sense, every possible absurdity is to be tolerated rather than give up that notion. "For," says Chemnitius, (and this is the only reason he assigns,) "if we might depart from the manifest "word of God on account of *inexplicable absurdities* (absurdi- "tates inexplicabiles) nothing would remain safe in the leading "articles of our faith."[1]

I will only say, that it is fearful to contemplate the probable consequences of such an admission, if generally made by the ministers of Christ. And it is obvious, that it is at least no departure from "the *manifest* word of God" to give a different interpretation to the words of institution, because many able men, holding even the doctrine of Transubstantiation, have confessed that those words admit of a sense not involving the real bodily presence.

Gerhard meets the objection with more prudence, but not more real solidity.[2] Denying that the blood is received with the bread or the flesh with the wine, and yet maintaining that the body of Christ as now living is, after a supernatural form, received into the mouths of the communicants with the bread, he evades the difficulty by alleging that it is a mystery beyond the human understanding,—that we are to leave the mode in which it is brought about to the Divine Omnipotence,—that we must explain the hypostatical union of the two natures in Christ before we ask questions on this point,—that the presence supposed, as well as the distribution and manducation, are not natural and local, but mystical, and which can neither be understood nor perceived,—and that the union of the body and

[1] Chemnit. Fundamenta Doctrinæ de Præsentia, &c. in Cœna. Witteb. 1615. p. 106.

[2] Gerhard. Loci Theolog. loc. 22. c. 16. § 185. ed. Cotta, tom. x. p. 317.

blood with the bread and wine is only a sacramental union.[1] But all these considerations leave the difficulty untouched and in its full force. In short, as is the case in the reply to almost all the objections raised, the sum total of the answer is this, —It is quite incomprehensible, but Christ said, "This is my body," and therefore it must be as we say. Now, it may be difficult to explain the nature of the hypostatical union between the two natures in the Person of Christ—perhaps impossible—but what then? It does not follow that it is not a palpable absurdity to deny, that where Christ's living body is, there the blood must be with the flesh. And all the epithets of supernatural, mystical, sacramental, and any others, can make no difference in this. The argument from the Divine omnipotence I have already noticed.[2]

(6.) This doctrine supposes the body and blood of Christ partaken of in the Eucharist to be immaterial and like a spirit, while the words of our Lord show us, that the body to be eaten there is the material body that was crucified on the cross, and the blood to be drunk there is the blood shed on the cross.

I have already made some remarks on this point when noticing the Scriptural argument on the subject.[3] But it is too important to be overlooked here. Our Lord's words clearly show, that the body *eaten* is the body *broken*, and the blood *drunk* is the blood *shed*. Both these were *material*. Of this there can be no denial. And we must depart widely indeed from the natural sense of our Lord's words to make them refer to an immaterial thing that could not be crucified. What we are to eat and drink are clearly the material body and blood that were present on the cross. And the only question is, whether we are to eat and drink them with our mouth, as the Capernaites supposed, or mentally and spiritually by an act of faith. It must be by one or the other.

[1] The term "sacramental union" is hardly a fair term to use in such a sense, because it is a phrase used in a very different sense, and most proper for describing a doctrine widely different from that here intended. A sacramental union of the body and blood of Christ with the consecrated elements, in the proper sense of the words, I should be sorry to deny.

[2] See pages 155—157, above.

[3] See pp. 66, 82, and 89, above; and also the quotation from Dean Aldrich in pp. 36, 37.

(7.) This doctrine supposes an *oral* manducation of an *immaterial* thing, a thing present only after the mode of existence belonging to a spirit; which is a manifest absurdity.

To maintain that we take into the mouth and eat, that is, swallow, that which is immaterial, impalpable, and has no local extension of parts or dimensions any more than a mathematical point, is so gross an absurdity, that it is difficult to understand how any man can allow himself to admit such a notion into his mind. It involves self-contradictions, as has been forcibly pointed out in a passage quoted in a former page,[1] from the works of Bishop Bilson. And I will here add what Bishop Jeremy Taylor says on the same point. He remarks:—

"Corporal manducation of Christ's body is apparently inconsistent with the nature and condition of the body. 1. Because that which is after the manner of a spirit, and not of a body, cannot be eaten and drunk after the manner of a body, but of a spirit; as no man can eat a Cherubim with his mouth, if he were made apt to nourish the soul: but by the confession of the Roman Doctors Christ's body is present in the Eucharist after the manner of a spirit, therefore without proportions to our body or bodily actions. 2. That which neither can feel, or be felt, see or be seen, move or be moved, change or be changed, neither do nor suffer corporally, cannot certainly be eaten corporally; but so they affirm concerning the body of our Blessed Lord; it cannot do or suffer corporally in the Sacrament, therefore it cannot be eaten corporally, any more than a man can chew a spirit, or eat a meditation, or swallow a syllogism into his belly."[2]

The reader will observe that the mode of presence here spoken of is precisely that maintained by the Authors under review, and whether it is held that the body so present is present by its substitution for the substance of the bread, as Transubstantiation supposes, or by union with the bread, as Consubstantiation supposes, this argument against the oral manducation of Christ's body, present after such a mode of being, remains the same.

The only reply that I can find made to this objection is, that the mouth eats the body of Christ in the Sacrament in a mystical and spiritual manner, and that thus it can eat it even when it is in the form of a spirit; and a great deal has been

[1] P. 52.

[2] Bp. J. Taylor's The Real Presence, &c. Sect. iii. § 9. ed. 1654. pp. 48, 49.

said in the way of illustrating the possibility of such a thing, though it seems generally admitted, that such a mode of eating is quite beyond our comprehension. But the final resort is, as on other occasions, to the words of institution, "This is my body."

Now I must be permitted to say, with Bishop Taylor, that this is not merely a thing beyond our comprehension, but involves nonsense. There is but one way in which the mouth can eat anything. There is no *spiritual* mode, as far as I am aware, of using the organs of manducation. And if we are to go against the testimony of all our senses, and imagine all manner of absurdities, rather than suppose that the words "This is my body," meant "This represents my body," we cannot be sure that Christ ever spoke these words, for we cannot in that case trust to the testimony of our sight or hearing; and so there is an end to the whole matter. It is hardly possible to conceive a more complete *reductio ad absurdum* than when the argument is brought down to this plea, that the mouth has two modes of eating, a natural and a spiritual, and that by the latter it can eat a spirit.

Among the illustrations brought to support this notion of there being two different modes of eating by the mouth, I can find none that appear to me in the slightest degree to favor it. For instance, it is said that angels are said in Scripture to have eaten and drunk on earth, and that this must have been an eating and drinking very different from natural eating and drinking. But it is quite possible, and I think probable, that material forms may have been given to such angels for the occasion, and that the eating and drinking might be after the manner in which mankind eat and drink. But if it were not so, and we had to admit that we knew not the manner of their eating, that would prove nothing in the case before us, which by the hypothesis is a different case. In whatever way angels may eat, man's mode of eating is not affected by that consideration. It is said also that Christ ate after his resurrection, but that this could not have been eating after a natural manner. This again, even if it were so, would prove nothing in the case in question; but I must altogether deny the fact. Our Lord repeatedly ate food in the presence of his disciples after his

resurrection. If this was not natural eating, what was it? Was not the food taken into the mouth of his body,—which we know from his own testimony to Thomas was material,—and swallowed? If we deny this, we deny the plain testimony of Scripture. If we admit it, we admit his eating in the natural manner. It does not follow that it was *necessary* for him to do so even on earth, still less that it was necessary for him to take such food after his ascension; for man does not live by bread alone, but by the word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God. But to deny that he ate naturally on the occasions referred to is to contradict the Scripture. And, as we have already seen in a previous page, Augustine clearly held this view.[1]

(8.) This doctrine either makes the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper consist of *three* parts instead of *two*, or makes the second part different from what the antient Church and our own maintain it to be.

It will hardly be denied, that the doctrine of the antient Church according to Augustine, and certainly of our own Catechism, is, that there are *two* parts in a sacrament, and that these two parts are "the outward visible sign and *the inward spiritual grace*." But according to the doctrine of our authors, in one of the two sacraments there are *three;* namely, the outward visible sign, the thing which that outward visible sign represents, and the inward and spiritual grace; and it is maintained, that the two former are truly received by all communicants, and the third only by faithful communicants. Thus, Archdeacon Wilberforce expressly speaks of the Eucharist as consisting of the "sacramentum," the "res sacramenti," and the "virtus sacramenti;" of which he maintains that the two former are received by all communicants, and the third by the faithful only.[2]

The same thing is done by Archdeacon Denison. He also distinguishes between the "*sacramentum*," the "*res sacramenti*," and the "*virtus* or *gratia sacramenti*."[3]

I grant that both these authors, in order to save themselves from a palpable contrariety to the doctrine both of the antient Church and our own, maintain that the Sacrament consists of

[1] See p. 152, above.

[2] On Euchar. pp. 119, 120, and 222, 223; or, 3rd ed. pp. 101, 102, and 190, 191.

[3] Serm. i. p. 39. Serm. ii. pp. 101 and 124.

two parts, and in the Eucharist they make these two parts to be the "*sacramentum*" and the "*res sacramenti;*" making the *virtus* or *gratia* to be an effect which may or *may not* follow from the reception of the *res*. But when they separate the *virtus* or *gratia sacramenti* from the *res sacramenti*, they are self-condemned in making the two parts of the Sacrament to be the *sacramentum* and the *res sacramenti;* because the two parts are the outward and visible sign and *the inward and spiritual grace*. And "*the outward and visible sign*" is "given unto us" "as a means whereby we receive the inward and spiritual grace," and the inward and spiritual grace in the Eucharist is "the strengthening and refreshing of our souls by the Body and Blood of Christ, as our bodies are by the bread and wine." And this grace comes to the receiver of the consecrated elements through faith feeding on the true body and blood of Christ, the "res sacramenti," or (in the words of our Church) "the inward part *or* THING SIGNIFIED" by the consecrated elements. The second part of the Sacrament is, according to the definition of Augustine and of our Church, "the inward and spiritual grace," the "*virtus*, or, *gratia sacramenti*," and not the "res sacramenti," or body and blood of Christ. And it is admitted, that this is received, and can only be received, by the soul. It is not pretended, that the communication of the *res sacramenti* to the body ensures the gift of the *virtus* or *gratia sacramenti* to the soul.

Archdeacon Denison consequently has been compelled directly to misrepresent the terms of the Catechism to make good his doctrine. He tells us,—"The latter portion of the Catechism, "following the distinctions elaborated by the schoolmen out of "the suggestion of St. Augustine, teaches, that the Sacrament "of the Lord's Supper has two parts—1. The outward visible "part or sign—2. The inward part, or Thing signified; and "that 'the inward part or Thing signified' is 'the Body and "Blood of Christ.'"[1]

Now the Catechism teaches no such thing; for it says of BOTH Sacraments, that they have two parts, and that those two parts are "the outward visible sign and *the inward spiritual*

[1] Serm. ii. p. 131.

*grace.*" And therefore what it says in the latter part respecting the Eucharist must be interpreted consistently with this. And the fact is, that like Augustine it identified the reception of the "*res sacramenti,*" or body and blood of Christ, with the reception of the *grace of the sacrament,* believing that where one was received the other was received, and neither received but by "*the faithful.*" The reception of the body of Christ in the sacrament is a spiritual act which brings the grace of the sacrament to the soul. It is not, as our Authors would have us suppose, a bodily act from which the soul may derive no benefit, but an act of the soul which brings to it the strengthening and refreshing effect of a union with Christ. But for the sake of greater clearness, apparently, the Catechism first speaks of the "res sacramenti," and then of the *virtus* or *gratia,* by which the souls of all who receive that "res sacramenti" are refreshed. And the two being thus spoken of as connected together, the latter part of the Catechism agrees with the former.

That part of our Catechism which relates to the sacraments was copied, with a few alterations, from Dean Nowell's smallest Catechism, and the *two* questions and answers just referred to are little more than a division into two, probably for the sake of perspicuity in the case of the child, of what in that previous Catechism had been given in one long one. The answer to the question as to the inward part in that Catechism stood thus:—

"The body and blood of Christ, which in the Lord's Supper are given to the faithful, and are by them taken, eaten, and drunken, only in a heavenly and spiritual manner, but yet in truth: so, that is, that like as bread nourishes our bodies, so also the body of Christ nourishes our souls spiritually through faith; and like as the hearts of men are cheered by wine, and their strength confirmed, so our souls are refreshed and renewed by the blood of Christ through faith; in which way the body and blood of Christ are received in the Supper. For Christ as surely makes those who trust in him partakers of his body and blood, as they certainly know that they have received the bread and wine with their mouth and stomach."

This long answer was—surely very wisely for the sake of the children for whose use the Catechism was put forth—broken into two, and expressed in fewer and clearer words. But there

is no disjunction of a reception of the *grace* of the sacrament from a reception of the *res*, or thing signified, of the sacrament, caused by such alteration. The "inward spiritual grace" remains the second part of the sacrament, otherwise the latter part of the Catechism would be repugnant to the former.

I have said that our Catechism, *like Augustine*, identifies the reception of the *res sacramenti* with the reception of the *virtus* or *gratia sacramenti*. And that Augustine does this, Archdeacon Wilberforce is compelled to acknowledge. For, observing that Augustine spoke of the Sacrament as consisting of two parts, he says,—"The outward part he called 'sacramentum,' "the inward part 'res sacramenti,' OR 'virtus sacramenti.' "The last two expressions, which he used *somewhat vaguely*, "were more accurately discriminated by later writers."[1] And again, "St. Augustine does not distinguish between the *res* "*sacramenti* and the *virtus sacramenti*; whereas it would be "more consistent to identify the first with the inward part or "thing signified, the second with its effect on the devout "soul."[2] That is to say, Augustine used indiscriminately the phrase "res sacramenti" or "virtus sacramenti" to represent the inward part of the Sacrament, or "the inward spiritual grace" of it, because he believed the *res* and the *virtus* or *gratia* necessarily to go together; but "later writers," having a totally different theory to maintain, and a notion of the bodily presence in the elements, and a reception of that body by all the communicants, faithful and wicked alike, did *not* use the words in this way, and Archdeacon Wilberforce agreeing with them is *equally at variance with Augustine*.

As a specimen of the way in which he deals with the language of Augustine, we may observe a note of his in this place. Augustine expressly says in one place,[3] that the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper is to some for life, to some for destruction: but that "*the thing itself of which it is a sacrament* (res ipsa, "cujus sacramentum est) *is to every man for life, to none for* "*destruction*." The only reply which Archdeacon Wilberforce has to make to this very plain passage is this,—"Here he pro-"bably uses *res sacramenti* for *virtus sacramenti*; for that his

[1] On Euch. p. 119. 3rd ed. p. 101. [2] Ib. p. 224. 3rd ed. p. 191.
[3] Comment. in Joann. tract. xxvi. c. 15.

"belief was, that the inward part or Body of Christ is received "by *all communicants*, is obvious from other passages;" referring to some passages in which the wicked are spoken of as receiving the Body and Blood of Christ.[1] Such a substitution of one word for another, in order to make the passage suitable to the Archdeacon's own views, is of course quite inadmissible: and as to his proof that Augustine held "all communicants" to receive the "*res sacramenti*," it simply betrays ignorance of Augustine's works, for Augustine repeatedly states that the wicked do *not* receive the "*res sacramenti*;" and in the face of this fact his occasionally speaking of them as receiving the body and blood of Christ, can present no difficulty to one who knows how he frequently urges the recollection, that the signs are constantly called by *the name of the things signified*, but that the one are not to be mistaken for the other.

(9.) The eating of Christ's body by *the mouth* of the communicant is the very notion of the Capernaites which our Lord rebuked.

For if our Lord's body is eaten by the mouth of the communicant, the eating is according to the natural mode of bodily eating, and not a spiritual act. And this was the notion which our Lord rebuked in the Capernaites. It makes no difference in this respect that the form under which our Lord's body is thus supposed to be orally eaten is considered to be of an immaterial and spiritual kind. What is rebuked by our Lord in John vi. is evidently the way in which the Capernaites confounded a spiritual act, an act to be performed by the spirit, with a natural act, or one to be performed by the mouth.

The Authors under review will perhaps reply, that they do not *exclude* the necessity of a *spiritual* act, but only *combine* with it a natural eating of Christ's body. But the reply fails in meeting the argument from our Lord's words, because He does not intimate such a *combination* of natural and spiritual eating in the manducation of his flesh, but speaks of the act as *altogether* a spiritual act.

It is urged, I am aware, that the body of Christ being supposed to be present in an immaterial form and supernatural

[1] p. 119; or 3rd ed. p. 101. See also pp. 224, 5; or, 191, 2.

way, the eating, though by the mouth, must be considered as of a supernatural kind. But this I must take leave to dispute. An eating by the mouth is a natural kind of eating, whatever men may imagine to be the nature of that which is put into it, and by whatever terms they may call it.

And our Lord tells the Capernaites, that the eating of his flesh in the way in which they supposed it was to be eaten would profit nothing. True, they appear to have thought that it was to be eaten in a material form, but then if it would profit nothing when eaten in the *material* form, certainly (I might say *à fortiori*) it would profit nothing when eaten in the imagined *immaterial* form. Whatever benefit could be obtained from Christ's body when eaten in an *immaterial* form must certainly be obtainable from eating it in its *material* form. It cannot be imagined that there is more force or power or virtue in the supposed *immaterial* form of Christ's body than there is in that *material* form in which it exists in a glorified and exalted condition at the right hand of the Father.

(10.) If the Body and Blood of Christ are so joined to the bread and wine that the mouth of every communicant in receiving one necessarily receives the other, then brute animals eating and drinking the bread and wine receive the Body and Blood of Christ.

This objection is noticed by Archdeacon Denison, and the only reply he can give to it (as I have noticed p. 49 above) is, that we are not told what the consecrated elements may be to the brute creation, and therefore *cannot affirm anything on the subject*. The reader therefore will observe, that instead of shrinking back with horror from such a notion, the Archdeacon is satisfied with declining to give any formal opinion upon the point. It may be so, or it may not, he thinks; and with that expression of indifference upon the subject, he is content. That the blessed and glorified body of the living and exalted Saviour should be taken by a brute animal into his mouth and swallowed and passed into his stomach, is a doctrine upon the truth or falsehood of which he feels himself unable to decide.

He is not *quite prepared as yet to affirm* with consistent Romanists that it is so; perhaps it may; but he cannot venture exactly to determine.

Now this is a view from which even many Romanists shrink. Bishop Gardiner, in his controversy with Archbishop Cranmer, calls it blasphemy, and rebukes Cranmer, though most unjustly, for charging the Romanists with teaching the doctrine.[1]

Even Harding, in his Answer to Bishop Jewel, calls it a "vile asseveration," though obliged to admit that the view was maintained by some Romanists. And Bishop Jewel justly says, that "the old holy Fathers, St. Ambrose, St. Augustine, St. Hierome, "St. Chrysostom . . . would rather have thought him worthy "to be *locked up as a madman* that would either have taught it, "as great numbers have done, or else *have doubted of it*." [2]

But there can be no doubt that consistency requires all who hold the doctrine of the Romanists or that of Archdeacon Denison to maintain this view, and accordingly we find some of the best of the Romish doctors stoutly contending for it.

Thus, Thomas Aquinas says,—"Some have said, that as soon as the sacrament is touched of a mouse or a dog, the body of Christ ceases to be there. But this is *derogatory to the truth of the sacrament*." [3]

Johannes de Burgo asserts, that the mouse, eating the sacrament, receives the body of Christ; though not sacramentally. [4]

Similar testimonies are given by Bishop Jewel from Alexander de Hales and Gerson.

And accordingly Antoninus, Archbishop of Florence, (like De Burgo) directs, that if a mouse or any other animal eats the sacrament, you must catch it, if you can, and burn it, *and its ashes are to be "buried in or about the altar."* And another Romish doctor gives other directions on the subject, which I shall not defile these pages by quoting. [5]

And it must be admitted, that if the body of Christ is so joined to the elements that it must be eaten by wicked and pro-

See CRANMER'S Answer to Gardiner, Park. Soc. ed. p. 67.

JEWEL'S Reply to Harding, art. 23. Works, P. S. ed. vol. 2. p. 782.

[3] Si mus vel canis hostiam consecratam manducet, substantia corporis Christi non desinit esse sub speciebus, quamdiu species illæ manent, hoc est, quamdiu substantia panis maneret: sicut etiam si projiceretur in lutum . . . . Quidam autem dixerunt, quod statim cum sacramentum tangitur a mure vel cane, desinit ibi esse corpus Christi. Quod etiam derogat veritati sacramenti. THOM. AQUIN. Summ. Theol. Part. 3. Quæst. 80. art. 3. Ed. Paris. 1631. p. 213.

[4] J. DE BURGO, Pupill. oculi. De custod. Euch. Argent. 1518. fol. 27.

See JEWEL, as above cited.

fligate men when receiving the elements, there seems no good reason why we should deny that it can be eaten by brute animals. And from the former position the latter is deduced in the Gloss on the Canon Law, which, after denying that the mouse receives the body of Christ, fairly enough says, "If, however, it is said that a mouse takes the body of Christ, there is no great impropriety in that, since the most wicked men take it." [1]

But there is something so awful in such a tenet, that others, in spite of the inconsistency, ventured to think that in some way or other the body of Christ was withdrawn, so as not to be eaten by brute animals. Thus Bonaventura, after due consideration, pronounces this opinion to be "more decent and more reasonable" (honestior et rationabilior).[2]

Peter Lombard, the famous Master of the Sentences, though declining to say what it is that the mouse eats, yet thinks it *may* be said that it is not the body of Christ. "It *may* truly be said, that the body of Christ is not taken by brute animals, although it appears to be. What then does the mouse take, or what does it eat? God knows this." [3]

But even in this very moderate statement he went too far for the authorities of his Church, for this is one of the passages in his works respecting which it is announced that he is not adhered to by all.[4]

Pope Innocent III., however, boldly pronounced against the opinion that the mouse eats the body of Christ, and his very original and remarkable mode of getting over the difficulty is this, that when the mouse comes, the body of Christ "ceases to be in the sacrament, and the substance of bread in some way by a miracle returns;" not, he is careful to tell us, *that* substance of bread that had "passed into the flesh of Christ," but "another substance miraculously created in its place." [5]

[1] Si tamen dicatur quod [mus] sumat [i. e. corpus Christi], non est magnum inconveniens, cum sceleratissimi homines illud sumant. De Cons. dist. 2. §. qui bene. *Gloss.* Corp. J. C. Lugd. 1624. tom. 1. col. 1964.

[2] In Libr. Sentent. iv. dist. 13. art. 2. q. 1.

[3] Illud etiam sane dici potest quod a brutis animalibus corpus Christi non sumitur, etsi videatur. Quid ergo sumit mus, vel quid manducat? Deus novit hoc. Pet. Lombard. Lib. Sentent. lib. iv. dist. 13. Ed. Paris. 1510. Part 2. fol. 97.

[4] Non tenetur communiter ab omnibus. Ibid. fol. sign. ccciii. *vers.*

[5] Si vero quæratur, quid a mure comeditur, cum sacramentum corroditur . . . respondetur, quod sicut miraculose substantia panis convertitur in corpus Domini.

The Body of Christ therefore goes away, (according to the Gloss on the Canon Law, "is snatched up into heaven,"[1]) when the mouse nibbles the sacrament, and a second miracle is worked by which the substance of bread comes back to the accidents, for the benefit apparently of the mouse.

But enough of such painful trifling. One thing, however, these statements certainly teach us, namely, the difficulties to which those are reduced, who maintain, that the body of Christ is, by the act of consecration, in or under the bread, and yet deny that the body of Christ is eaten by brute animals eating the consecrated bread; and that consistency requires that those who maintain the former view should also maintain the latter.

I now proceed to the proposed *second part* of this chapter, namely, to consider

II. The sophisms and fallacies by which the doctrine of the Authors under review is supported.

(1.) The first I would notice is the sophism, that a denial of their doctrine as to the effects of consecration, makes the consecration a mere nugatory act.

The Authors under review conduct their whole argument upon the assumption, that unless an effect is supposed to be produced upon the elements such that they become in some way or other the Body and Blood of Christ, the act of consecration is reduced to a nullity.

Thus, Archdeacon Denison speaks of those who deny that the elements become the Body and Blood of Christ, as "denying *in toto* the consecrating power."[2]

Archdeacon Wilberforce, throughout his whole work, speaks of the same parties as denying the *reality* and *validity* of consecration.[3]

But this is merely throwing dust into the eyes of the reader. The question first to be settled is, what the act of consecration was intended to effect; and this, I contend, was merely the solemn

cum eum incipit esse sub sacramento, sic quodammodo miraculose revertitur, cum ipsum ibi desinit esse, non quod illa panis substantia revertatur, quæ transivit in carnem, sed quod ejus loco alius miraculose creatus, quamvis hujus accidentia sine subjecto possunt sic corrodi, sicut edi. INNOCENT. III. Myster. Miss. lib. iv. c. 11. Op. Colon. 1575. tom. i. p. 380.

[1] See p. 176 above.

[2] Serm. 2. p. 116.

[3] The argument, like almost all the rest, is borrowed from the Romanists. See BELLARM. De Euch. lib. ii. cc. 9 & 14.

setting apart of the elements for a holy use and purpose, and thus giving them a different *character* and *use* from that which they had before, and fitting them, in the way prescribed by Divine command, to be food, through the right reception of which the faithful followers of Christ become partakers, spiritually and by faith, of the Body and Blood of Christ.

Archdeacon Wilberforce's argument (in ch. 1 and 2 of his Work) upon the subject of consecration, is far from proving his point. He says, that "consecration is the essential characteristic of the Holy Eucharist: for our Lord does not speak of bread at large, or wine in general, but of *This*, i. e. of that which was consecrated or set apart."[1] Now, without stopping to notice again here what I have already remarked upon,[2] namely, that when the word "This" was pronounced, the consecration is not supposed to have taken place, I admit at once, that our Lord did not mean, that whenever Christians should partake of any bread and wine, they would be made partakers of his Body and Blood. No one supposes, that if persons sit down to an ordinary meal of bread and wine, of which there is no solemn consecration such as our Lord has prescribed for the purposes of his Supper, there is any special communion with Christ to be expected from the participation of them.

The bread and wine are no doubt made, by consecration, sacred symbols of the Body and Blood of Christ, and in the case of the faithful recipients, *effective* symbols; which is all that the Archdeacon's extracts from the Fathers[3] affirm; and I quite assent to his conclusion, "that the consecration of the elements was understood to be the characteristic circumstance upon which the validity of the sacrament was dependent."[4] But nothing follows from this, except that such solemn setting apart is necessary for the due celebration of the ordinance.

The Archdeacon proceeds to tell us, that the truth of his conclusion "appears both from the importance which from the first "was attached to the act of consecration, and from the belief "that it could not be effected save by those to whom a specific "commission had been transmitted."[5]

Now I do not call in question his conclusion, nor do I doubt that the act of consecration was from the first considered of

[1] p. 9. 3rd ed. p. 7. [2] See p. 71—79 above. [3] pp. 10, 11. 3rd ed. pp. 8, 9.
[4] p. 11. 3rd ed. p. 9. [5] p. 11. 3rd ed. p. 9.

importance. Whether certain parties only were authorized to perform the act of consecration, is a point which proves nothing in the present question. But I must take the liberty of disputing the correctness of the Archdeacon's statement, that the power of performing the act of consecration *was* so *limited;* and certainly it does not follow, that if the Council of Nice recognised it as "an acknowledged fact" that priests only had authority to consecrate, they must have thought that "the consecrated elements became other than they were before."[1] I am quite at a loss to see the sequence of one from the other. Whether, therefore, those only who have been admitted to the priesthood have authority to consecrate the elements in the Lord's Supper, I shall not now stop to inquire,[2] as it would not in the slightest degree show what is the *effect* of consecration.

Let it be remembered, therefore, that we may maintain the reality and validity and necessity of consecration, and even the sole authority of presbyters to perform the act, and yet utterly deny the change in the consecrated elements for which the Authors under review are contending. The two things are totally distinct from one another.

And it is curious, and not a little painful, to see the way in which Archdeacon Wilberforce, conscious of the difference in his language from that of the divines of our Church, endeavours to account for it. He says,—"Since the necessity of consecration "is thus attested by the very nature of our ritual, how comes "it not to have been put more prominently forward by our "divines? For it can hardly be disputed, that the importance "of consecration has been little dwelt upon by many English "writers, and that its validity has not been understood by our "people to be the circumstance on which the efficacy of this "sacrament depends." And he ascribes this circumstance to the desire not to offend the foreign Protestants, who, he says, "had lost all value for that act of consecration, which is never "found to be permanently appreciated, when men have re-"nounced the ministerial commission which is essential to its "reality." And having thus conveniently *taken it for granted,* that our early divines held his views, but out of private regard

[1] p. 12. 3rd ed. p. 10.

[2] I may here refer, however, to the remarks I have made on this point in my "Divine Rule of Faith, &c.," vol. ii. pp. 225—32. 2nd edition.

for the foreign Protestants suppressed the expression of them, (a mode of reasoning which would enable us to prove anything), and observed that "the course of events and the progress of infidel opinions have since forced upon all Catholic Christians" "the necessity of adhering at all hazards to the principles of the ancient Church," he thus jumps to his desired conclusion,—"So THAT, in assigning to consecration the place "awarded to it by the teaching of Scripture and the testimony "of Primitive Antiquity, we are not forsaking the principles of "our own Church, but only bringing out those truths which "*the circumstances of a former generation withheld it from ex-*"*pressing.*"[1]

Does the Archdeacon suppose that such reasoning as this can have any other effect than that of injuring his own character for fair dealing?

The whole stream of our great divines are entirely opposed to his views in this matter, as we shall see more clearly in a future chapter. I refer not merely to our Reformers, whom the Archdeacon most unjustly and groundlessly accuses of concealing their views from regard to the foreign Protestants, but to those of a subsequent period. Even the authors whom his party frequently quote as maintaining their views, are entirely opposed to him.

For instance, Bishop Cosin, noticing the very same argument as proceeding from Bellarmine, namely, that if there is no "*real change*" (realis mutatio) of the elements, the consecration is reduced to nothing, and "what omnipotence is required to do nothing" (quæ omnipotentia requiritur ad faciendum nihil?) replies,—

"But Protestants answer, that the greatness, majesty, excellency, and dignity of the Sacrament is such, that they admire no less the omnipotency of God in *sanctifying the* CREATURES *to so high an* OFFICE *and so holy an* USE, than in creating the world out of nothing, or changing the nature of things by the ministry of his prophets. For it is not by man's power, but by the Divine virtue, that things *earthly and mean* of themselves, are *made to us* ASSURED PLEDGES *of the body and blood of Christ.*"[2]

[1] pp. 18—20. 3rd ed. pp. 15, 16.

[2] BISHOP COSIN'S Hist. of Transubst. p. 160. ed. 1840.

The Archdeacon proceeds, in the second chapter, to consider the *effect* of consecration; and he tells us, that as consecration "is the essential characteristic of the Holy Eucharist," it "follows," "that the inward blessing resulting from this ordi-"nance is bestowed *through its outward form.*"[1]

Now, in the sense in which the Archdeacon uses the words "through its outward form," this certainly does not follow. That the consecrated bread and wine are, to the faithful "the means whereby they receive" the inward and spiritual grace of the Sacrament (according to the words of our Catechism), is certainly true, and so far the blessing may be said to be bestowed through the outward form. But the Archdeacon uses the words to convey the notion, that the Body and Blood of Christ are communicated first to the bread and wine by their consecration, and so pass through or by them, as a sort of conduit or conductor, to every receiver; which is no necessary consequence of consecration. Consecration is, no doubt, an "essential characteristic of the Holy Eucharist," and through it the bread becomes to the faithful recipient the communion of the Body of Christ, and the wine the communion of the Blood of Christ. But to effect this, there is no need that they should *become*, in any way, the Body and Blood of Christ. They may be made valid instruments to work the end proposed, without any such change as this being wrought upon them. And consequently the whole of the Archdeacon's argumentation on this point falls to the ground, for it proceeds upon the assumption that *such* a change must take place upon the elements to fit them to be of any use or effect even to the faithful recipient. And in arguing upon this assumption, he is certainly inconsistent with his own admission, that sacraments are only "moral instruments," and "means" which "derive their whole efficacy from God's continual intervention."[2] For if this is the case, why should not the reception of the consecrated bread and wine bring us, through God's intervention, into full and close spiritual communion with the body and blood of Christ, and make us partakers of the benefits of a spiritual union with Christ, without the actual commixture, or conjunction, or substitution of that body and blood with or for the bread and wine?

[1] p. 21. 3rd ed. p. 17. [2] p. 24. 3rd ed. p. 19.

The rest of the chapter is devoted to an attack upon the systems of Zuinglius and Calvin. And therefore, as I am not writing for the defence of either one or the other, or of any individual's system of doctrine, I shall offer but few remarks on this part of his work. But I must say, that as it respects both, his statements are full of errors and sophistical misrepresentations, arising, apparently, partly from that *ex parte* view of the subject which pervades the whole book, and partly from obvious mental confusion.

He tells us that the "three principles on which the blessing bestowed in the Holy Eucharist may be supposed to depend," are, "1st, the value of the gift bestowed, which implies that "the gift is through the elements [which is his own view]; "2ndly, the mere intention of the Giver, Calvin's system; "3rdly, the mere disposition of the receiver, Zuinglius's "system."[1] And again he intimates that Zuinglius supposed "the force and efficacy of the Holy Eucharist to depend merely upon the disposition of the receiver," and that such a supposition "destroys all belief in the objective reality of the gift."[2]

Now, when he speaks of "the value of the gift bestowed which implies that the gift is through the elements," and of "the objective reality of the gift," he means that the flesh of Christ is endued with a certain virtue and efficacy through its union with the Godhead, and that when that flesh, as present in the elements, is eaten by our mouths, the gift is bestowed and received by us.

But though he calls this his own system, so completely opposed is it to the testimony both of Scripture and the Fathers, that, as we have already observed, he finds it impossible to adhere to it with anything like consistency. For he admits that Christ's flesh is food only for the soul, and not for the body, and that the soul *does not, and cannot, partake of it without the exercise of faith.*

Bearing this in mind, let us examine his charges against Zuinglius and Calvin.

Now, I know that it is the fashion to accuse Zuinglius of maintaining that the consecrated elements are mere naked and

[1] See Table of Contents to ch. ii. and p. 33; or 3rd ed. p. 27.
[2] p. 32. 3rd ed. p. 26.

inoperative signs, and some of his expressions may have given some pretext for the accusation, and hence the term "Zuinglianism" as an old term of reproach in this controversy; but I very much doubt whether, upon the whole, he is fairly open to such a charge. Upon this point, however, I do not intend to enter. But as to the point referred to by the Archdeacon, the question he has raised between him and Zuinglius may be settled without going into this. He complains that Zuinglius supposes "the force and efficacy of the Holy Eucharist to depend merely upon the disposition of the receiver." But that it depends upon the disposition of the receiver, he is compelled to hold himself; for he admits that the reception of the Sacrament is of no use in the case of those devoid of faith, and that nothing is received by the soul in such a case. He will, no doubt, reply,—But yet the gift has been received by the body, and the gift "has its value in itself." But the obvious answer is, that reception by the body, of that which is admitted to be food only for the soul, and which is not communicated to the soul through its reception by the body, is *no reception at all*. The gift does not pass to the soul, except there is a suitable disposition in the receiver. The soul, which is admitted to be the only part of man capable of receiving the gift, does not otherwise receive it; and therefore the spiritual nourishment can no more be said to be given, than bread put into a man's dress can be said to be given to his body.

As to the interpretation given by the Archdeacon to various expressions he has culled from the voluminous works of Zuinglius, it is clear upon the face of them that they do not justify it. For instance, in the case of the words quoted to prove that Zuinglius denies, "that grace is conveyed or communicated by any sacrament,"[1] the words prove nothing more than that grace does not pass *through the elements* into the soul; and we have only to consult the context of the passage to see that this was the point on which Zuinglius was speaking; and this doctrine is no part of what is called "Zuinglianism," otherwise all our great divines of former times were "Zuinglians."

In a similar way he brings various heavy charges against Zuinglius as to his "failing to recognize our Lord's humanity,

[1] p. 30. 3rd ed. p. 24.

either as the means whereby he intercedes for his brethren with the Father, or whereby he communicates to them Divine gifts," and thus "denying the mediation of Christ;"[1] and again as to his supposing, "that the action of the Divine Spirit has superseded that of the God-man," and so verging upon Sabellianism, as imagining that "the functions of the one Person in the Ever-blessed Trinity supersede those of the other."[2]

All these charges are, in fact, founded upon the Archdeacon's viewing all doctrine through the medium of his own most unorthodox and uncatholic notion, that the principle of spiritual life to fallen man is a certain virtue in our Lord's flesh, which is to be eaten by our mouths, and taken into our bodies, that we may be made partakers of that principle of life. Holding this view, he makes the mission of the Holy Spirit by our Lord perfectly useless, and even talks of our Lord being represented as superseded by the Holy Spirit by those who speak of his acting in such a way, and runs off into vague and groundless charges of Sabellianism, founded simply and solely upon what I must call his own wild misconceptions of the real character of the doctrine he is assailing.

From Zuinglius he proceeds to Calvin, and never were the views of any writer more completely misrepresented. He tells us that, "according to him," "the elements are not to be looked upon as an instrument of effecting anything, but merely as indications of the purpose of God."[3] How the Archdeacon can commit himself to such representations, is unaccountable. They are utterly opposed to Calvin's constant statements. For instance, Calvin says, "The name of the body and blood is attributed to the elements, because they are as it were *instruments by which our Lord Jesus Christ distributes them to us*."[4] Again, "Because "the sign does not only figure the thing which it is consecrated "to represent, as a naked and empty token, but doth also truly "offer it, why may not the name of the thing properly belong "to it?"[5] Such expressions occur constantly in his writings.

[1] p. 27. 3rd ed. p. 22. [2] p. 31. 3rd ed. p. 25. [3] p. 35. 3rd ed. p. 28.

[4] Corporis et sanguinis nomen eis attributum, quod sint veluti instrumenta, quibus Dominus Jesus Christus nobis ea distribuit. CALVIN. De Cœna Domini. Op. ed. 1667. tom. viii. p. 3.

[5] Quia tamen rem cui repræsentandæ consecratum est, non figurat tantùm, ceu nuda et inanis tessera, sed vere etiam exhibet, cur non ejus appellatio in ipsum jure competat. ID. Instit. iv. 17. 21.

But, because he does not hold the elements to be *such* as the Archdeacon represents them to be, therefore he is reproached as denying to them any instrumentality at all in effecting the purpose of the Supper.

So again he accuses him of denying "the sacredness of the elements," and asserting that "they were *merely signs or pledges*," and that "they *neither require consecration, nor are they the means of communicating any gift*;" [1] statements directly opposed to Calvin's known views. Calvin, as the passages just quoted prove, holds that the bread and wine require consecration, and that when consecrated they are not naked and empty signs, but effective instruments by which our Lord acts in the case of his faithful followers; just as in the case of baptism he says, "the water of baptism is not changed in itself, but begins "to be to us what it was not before, as soon as the promise is "annexed." [2] But he justly accuses those who hold such views of the effect of consecration as the Archdeacon, of turning consecration into a magical incantation; [3] and hence, in true Romish style, he is charged with denying altogether the necessity or use of consecration.[4]

"He objects," says the Archdeacon, "to rest upon 'consecratio' as being 'magica incantatio.' Inst. iv. 17. 15." [5]

A more painful misrepresentation of an author's words could not be found. Calvin's words are, that "the cause of so irra-"tional an imagination [that the body of Christ is eaten by "the corporal mouth] was, that consecration was with them "[the Papists] of as much power as a magical incantation "[consecratio tantundem apud eos valebat ac magica incan-"tatio]." And so, because he objected to this Romish view of

[1] p. 36. 3rd ed. p. 30.

[2] Aqua baptismi in se non mutatur, sed nobis esse incipit quod prius non erat, simulatque annexa est promissio. CALV. Inst. iv. 17. 15.

[3] ID. ib.

[4] To such an extent is this carried, that in a subsequent page he tells us, that Zuinglius and Calvin, "denying that the inward gift in the Holy Eucharist is communicated through the outward form," "affirm this belief to be the necessary result of *admitting consecration*." (p. 42. 3rd ed. p. 35.) Will the Archdeacon have the goodness to point out *where* they "affirm" this? If he refers to their mode of celebrating the service, he must prove that they do less than what we are told by Justin Martyr was done by the Primitive Christians in his time.

[5] p. 32. 3rd ed. p. 26.

consecration, he is traduced as altogether denying its use or validity.

With this misstatement of his views Calvin had to deal in his lifetime, from a certain Gabriel de Saconay, Præcentor of the Church of Lyons. And thus he answered it,—

"Gabriel is very angry that Calvin should have said, that the consecration of the Papists is a piece of magic borrowed from the Pagans, and that it differs nothing from a species of incantation. . . . . *Pure and legitimate consecration Calvin reverently receives and regards* (puram et legitimam consecrationem reverenter suscipit ac suspicit), by which, under the symbols of bread and wine, Christ makes us partakers of his flesh and blood. But it behoves us to observe what that is; namely, that in which the promise by which Christ invites us to a participation of his flesh and blood is clearly heard. For he wished to be understood by his disciples, when he said, This is my body. Whence also Augustine calls it the word of faith, by which the Sacrament is made out of the visible element (sacramentum conficitur ex visibili elemento)." [1]

His representation of Calvin's views as to *ordination*, is also wholly incorrect. Calvin did not hold that ordination conferred upon a man the power of turning, whenever he pleased, a piece of bread into something which either is or contains the real body of Christ, and putting that real body into the mouths of all communicants. This, in the Archdeacon's view, is unpardonable, and accordingly he is represented as maintaining that ordination is unnecessary. Any ordination that does not give this power is, according to the Archdeacon, useless; and therefore he represents Calvin as being indifferent about ordination, and as exercising "ministerial functions without ordination." [2] But what does Calvin himself say? "We "admit that priests are the dispensers of the mysteries of God; "and therefore the legitimate administrants of the Supper; "but I mean those ordained by the rite of Christ and his "apostles and the antient Church, in which imposition of "hands only was used, without unction and other follies;" and he adds, that one of the objects for which they are appointed

[1] Calvin. Gratul. ad Gabr. de Saconay Præcent. Lugdun. Op. tom. viii. p. 327.

[2] p. 32, &c. 3rd ed. p. 26.

is, "to administer the Sacraments."[1] Again; "No man in his "senses makes all Christians equal in the administration of the "word and sacraments; not only because all things ought to "be done decently and in order in the Church, but because, by "the special command of Christ, ministers are ordained for "that purpose. Therefore, since a peculiar vocation is re- "quired, let no one but one who is called take to himself the "honour. Heb. v. 4."[2]

And in order still further to damage the doctrine of Calvin on this subject, the Archdeacon seeks to identify it with the doctrine of reprobation, with which it has no necessary connection. The doctrine of Calvin on the Lord's Supper has been in fact held by those who have altogether repudiated his doctrine of election and reprobation. But the Archdeacon finds very little difficulty in reaching any desired conclusion, and his ingenious method of proceeding in the case before us is this. He finds that Calvin called the elements seals and pledges of God's bestowal of what was represented by them, and also held that the bestowal did not take place in all cases, and therefore (as no doubt is the case) had to point out why the outward pledges were not always attended by the desired result. And then he tells us of Calvin's doctrine of election and reprobation, as showing the way in which the answer to this question was given.[3] But it is strange that the Archdeacon should not see, that this forms no part of Calvin's doctrine on the Eucharist itself. Others may hold Calvin's doctrine on the Eucharist, and answer the proposed question in a different way, and say that the elements are seals and pledges to all *worthy* communicants. The Archdeacon has here confounded two things perfectly distinct. In fact, his own doctrine is quite as much open to such a charge as that of Calvin; for as he limits the benefit of the Eucharist to the faithful, one who held his view of the Eucharist, and joined with it the doctrine of Calvin on Election and Reprobation, would limit the benefit to the elect.

But having in this way connected together Calvin's doctrine of the Eucharist and his doctrine on Election and Reprobation,

[1] Artic. Facult. Paris. cum Antidoto. art. viii. Op. tom. viii. p. 194.
[2] Acta Syn. Trid. cum Antid. Sess. 7. 10. Op. tom. viii. p. 257.
[3] pp. 38, 39. 3rd ed. pp. 32, 33.

he proceeds throughout his work to identify one with the other, and load the former with all the odium and reproaches he thinks due to the latter; actually telling us, that "the "objection against Calvin's theory of the Holy Eucharist is, "that it *involves that dogma of reprobation*, which is the oppro- "brium of his system." And hence he concludes, that "as "the theory of Zuinglius has been shown to be inconsistent "with the first principles of Christian piety, so is Calvin's with "any due respect for the declarations of Scripture and the "character of God. And thus are we thrown back upon the "reality of consecration, and upon a belief that the inward gift "in the Holy Eucharist is bestowed through the outward "form."[1]

Now, whether the doctrine of Zuinglius or Calvin on the Eucharist is the true doctrine or not, is another question; but there can be no doubt as to the positive puerility of such argumentation as this. It may be the result of mental confusion, but it is a somewhat remarkable specimen of it.

It is worth notice that the chapter concludes with a delicate intimation that Hooker was a Calvinist and Waterland a Zuinglian in this matter. For though it is intimated, that the censure is confined to "those expressions which imply them to have been infected by the influence of foreign Protestantism," it is clearly stated, that the former held that "our Lord's pre- "sence is to be looked for *in the receiver, and not in the sacra- "ment;*" and the latter, "that the gift bestowed is bestowed *through the ordinance and not through the elements,*" and that these views are "ESSENTIAL PARTS" of the theories of Calvin and Zuinglius, or (to use his own words) "of those very theories "which were invented as substitutes for the reality of conse- "cration."[2]

We are obliged to him for this candid admission, and not the less so because he is also compelled to admit, that "each "had derived the larger part of his opinions from the teaching "of Antiquity."[3]

As to the testimony of the antient Church, given in ch. iii., that the effect of consecration is what Archdeacon Wilberforce

[1] p. 40. 3rd ed. p. 33. [2] pp. 44, 45. 3rd ed. p. 37. [3] Ib.

considers it to be, that will come under our consideration hereafter, when we are considering the testimonies of the Fathers. But in his concluding remarks on the subject of consecration in this chapter, the Archdeacon again speaks so as to identify a denial of his doctrine with a denial of the reality and validity of consecration, and therefore so as entirely to mislead the reader. Thus he says,—"How is it possible that those who admit the "reality of consecration should deny the efficacy of the ele-"ments?" "With what intention can they be consecrated, except "that they should be effectual?" "Those who deny that a gift "is communicated through the elements, cannot really believe "the validity of consecration." And he talks of the mockery "of a form of consecration whereby nothing is made holy."[1] Now, as it respects the great mass of his opponents, this language is totally irrelevant to their case. It may answer the Archdeacon's purpose in raising a prejudice in the popular mind against all who oppose his views. But the Archdeacon must be perfectly aware that it does not represent their doctrine. They believe that the elements are made holy, separated from all profane purposes, and devoted to a sacred use. They believe in the efficacy of the consecrated elements for producing the end which our Lord designed them to answer. They believe that to the *faithful* communicant their reception is the means whereby the Body and Blood of Christ are truly partaken of, though they would avoid the ambiguous phrase "through the elements," lest they might be supposed to countenance the Archdeacon's notion, that our Lord takes up his abode in the bread and wine, and is received by the mouth of the communicants, and eaten by the unbelieving as well as by the faithful.

The *second* sophism I would notice is,—

(2.) The charge of Zuinglianism or Calvinism against all who interpret the words of institution figuratively; and the calumny that a denial of the real bodily presence in the elements involves the assertion that the consecrated bread and wine are in all cases mere naked and inoperative signs.

Thus Archdeacon Wilberforce tells us, that when "Archbishop

[1] pp. 86—88. 3rd ed. pp. 74, 75.

Cranmer abandoned his belief in the real presence," "the Zuinglo-Calvinistic system took possession of our Churches."[1]

So Dr. Pusey,—"If, as *the Genevan School* would have it, the words, 'This is my Body,' were figurative," &c.[2]

This passage is referred to with approbation by Archdeacon Denison, who also tells us, in his usual tone of dogmatism on this subject, that "it has been attempted, *in the face of the testi-* "*mony of the Church Catholic*, to assign a *figurative* character to "the words of Institution."[3]

How far Archdeacon Denison has a right to speak thus confidently of "the testimony of the Church Catholic," may, I think, be questioned; and certainly in this case he has shown himself but little acquainted with it.

Of the views of antient writers, I have already given a specimen from the works of Tertullian and Augustine.[4]

What also has been the doctrine of High Church divines among ourselves in former times on the point, we may learn from the extract I have given in a former page,[5] from a work of Dean Aldrich. And an abundance of testimonies might be added to this, from the writings of others among our greatest divines.

I pass over Cranmer and Jewel, because it is notorious that they contended for the *figurative* character of the words of Institution.

As to Hooker, what can be plainer than the following:—

"As Christ is *termed* our life, because through him we obtain life, so, the parts of this sacrament are Christ's body and blood, for that they are so to us who receiving *them*, receive *that by them* which they are *termed*. The bread and cup are his body and blood, because they are *causes instrumental*, upon the receipt whereof the *participation* of his body and blood ensueth. For that which produceth any certain effect, is not vainly nor improperly *said to be* that very effect whereunto it tendeth."[6]

Bishop Bilson (constantly referred to by Dr. Pusey's party as supporting their doctrine) is decided and earnest in maintaining the figurative interpretation of the words. After con-

[1] p. 438, 9. 3rd ed. p. 378. The same tone is maintained throughout his work.
[2] Serm. p. 33. [3] Serm. i. p. 26. [4] See p. 70, above.
[5] See pp. 36—40 above. [6] HOOKER'S Eccles. Pol. v. lxvii. 5.

tending for "the *figurative* and spiritual construction of Christ's words," he adds,—

"Not one of the antient Fathers ever spake of your [the "Romanist's] real presence, or the *literal sense* of these words."[1] "The literal acception of these words as they lie, 'This (bread) "is my body,' is first impossible by your own confession, next "blasphemous by the plain level of our Creed, and lastly bar- "barous by the very touch and instinct of man's nature."[2] The Fathers, he tells us, "do not only witness that the bread "is *a sign* of Christ's body, but also *that Christ's words were* "*figurative*, and that in delivering the mysteries, he called the "bread his body, by way of signification, similitude, represen- "tation, after the manner of sacraments, *in a sign*, not accord- "ing to the letter, but in a spiritual and mystical understanding, "and if you respect the precise speech, *improperly and figura-* "*tively*."[3]

I suppose Archdeacon Denison is aware that Bishop Bilson is one of the most learned divines of our Church, and has shown in his works an intimate acquaintance with the works of the Fathers. In what condition, therefore, such statements from him place the Archdeacon's self-confident assertions about the doctrine of the Catholic Church in this matter, I leave him to judge.

Bishop Jeremy Taylor, another witness confidently appealed to by the Archdeacon's party, is equally clear in the same direction, and presses the point with many arguments. He says, on the words of Institution:—

"The bread is Christ's body in a *figurative improper* sense."[4] "It is figuratively, not properly and naturally, spoken of bread, "That it is the flesh or body of our Lord."[5] "There are very "many inducements to infer the figurative or tropical interpre- "tation." "We have great and fair and frequent precedents "for expounding this *est* by *significat*."[6] To the argument, that "the *literal* sense is to be presumed, unless the contrary be proved," he replies,—"Which is very true; but I have evi-

[1] Bilson's Christian Subjection, &c. p. 726. ed. 1585; p. 558. ed. 1586.
[2] Id. ib. p. 733; or, 568.
[3] Id. ib. p. 739; or, 576.
[4] Jer. Taylor, Real Presence, ed. cit. p. 105.
[5] Ib. p. 106.
[6] Ib. pp. 106—109.

dently *proved the contrary concerning the words of institution.*" [1]

Nay, the very divine who was recently put forward by Dr. Pusey as one of three referees to whom he sent us as showing that his doctrine is the doctrine of our Church, I mean Bishop Cosin, maintains precisely the same ground. For he says,—

"Certain it is, that the bread is not the body of Christ *any otherwise than as the cup is the New Testament;* and two different consequences cannot be drawn from those two not different expressions. Therefore, as the cup cannot be the New Testament but *by a sacramental figure*, no more can the bread be the body of Christ but *in the same sense.*" [2]

And he shows [3] that the Fathers take the same view.

These few words from Dr. Pusey's own special referee overturn his whole sermon from beginning to end.

In a future chapter the reader will find other similar testimonies, but for our purpose here the above appear sufficient.

The reader, therefore, may ask himself the question, whether he thinks the reproach of "Zuinglianism," &c. belongs to all our great divines.

In fact, it is obvious, that all who do not hold a *real corporal* or *bodily* presence *must* maintain that the words of institution were spoken in a *figurative* sense. And certainly the Church of England does not maintain a corporal or bodily presence in the Eucharist. And the way in which her rejection of this doctrine is reconciled by the Authors under review with the doctrine here opposed, namely, by maintaining that the body of Christ is present only in an *immaterial* form, is obviously inadmissible; because in whatever *form* the body is supposed to be present, if it *is* present, there is a *corporal* or *bodily* presence. If a body can be present in an immaterial form, or the form of a spirit, then the word *corporal* or *bodily* is not limited in its signification to a *material* body. And, as I have already shown, even the Church of Rome does not hold a *material* presence of the body of Christ in the Eucharist, and therefore our Church's protest against the doctrine of the bodily presence would be reduced to an absurdity, if it did not include the

[1] Ib. p. 142.
[2] Cosin's Hist. of Transubst. ed. 1840. p. 78
[3] Ib. p. 136.

notion of the presence of the body in the form in which the Church of Rome holds it to be present.

The distinction between the doctrine of our Church and that which is called "Zuinglianism," is obvious and most important. Our Church does not hold, that the consecrated elements are *inoperative signs*, to the reception of which by the faithful no particular blessing is, by promise, attached; but, that they are effective instruments, in the case of all faithful recipients, for bringing the communicant into a state of spiritual union and communion with Christ, and causing him to enjoy the blessings which such a union brings with it. As Bishop Taylor says,—"We do not say that in the Sacrament we only receive "the sign and figure of Christ's body; but all the real *effects* "*and benefits of it.*"[1] Or, as Bishop Cosin says, the outward part in the Sacrament "*represents* the inward part *truly and* "*efficaciously*, and makes all WORTHY RECEIVERS partakers "thereof."[2]

The third sophism I would point out is,—

(3.) The application of the phrase "real spiritual presence" to mean the real presence of Christ's body after the manner of existence of a spirit.

In the present condition of men's minds on such subjects nothing is easier than to mislead multitudes, even among the Clergy, by a misapplication of theological phrases on points of at all a recondite nature; and our Authors have been eminently successful in the case before us.

Our old divines have frequently insisted, and with good reason,—though circumstances may now have proved the phrase to be not free from danger—on the necessity of holding a *real spiritual presence* of Christ in the Eucharist. None more so, for instance, than Bishop Jeremy Taylor, who in fact took it as the title of his Treatise on the subject; but in what sense he used it, the extracts already given from him have sufficiently shown, and more shall be given hereafter. But the phrase, standing alone, has been a mine of wealth to the Authors under review. They seem to have thought it all they wanted. They had here alone, according to their notions, a sufficient proof that our old divines were of their mind in the matter. Our old divines, it is urged,

[1] J. TAYLOR, l. c. p. 142.

[2] COSIN, l. c. p. 136.

held a *real spiritual presence* of Christ in the Eucharist. And how can there be a real presence of Christ's body there, if his body is not really there? And *spiritual* means *of or belonging to a spirit*, and therefore the phrase must mean that his body is there after the manner of a spirit. And bread and wine form the Eucharist. And so, what can be plainer than that our old divines held that our Lord's real body and blood were present in the bread and wine in the form of existence belonging to a spirit?

Such is the pretty and, to some minds, plausible argument of the Tractarian school. And when employed by any one who to great self-confidence unites great want of acquaintance with the doctrinal history of the Church, and the writings of our old divines, it is urged as an argument quite incontrovertible.

That a body remaining a body should nevertheless be in the form of a spirit is, they will admit, rather mysterious; like black in the form of white; but then the whole subject here is mysterious, and our Lord said, "This is my body," and "everybody always everywhere" said, that this meant that the real body of Christ was in or with or under the form of the bread. That is, (that we may be quite correct) the Transubstantiationalists say, that "every body always everywhere" said it was under the form of the bread, taking the place of the substance of the bread; and the Consubstantiationalists, that "everybody always everywhere" said it was in or with the bread, but did *not* take its place. Is it not, then, double-dyed arrogance for anybody now to call it in question, "in the face of the testimony of the Church Catholic?"

But those who are not so easily influenced by words and names are inclined to carry their researches a little further. They naturally ask themselves the question, whether our old divines really thought that a body remaining a body could be at the same time a spirit, and that our Lord's body, remaining in heaven in a material form, could at the same time be present on hundreds of thousands of communion tables all over the world in the form of a spirit; so united, as a whole and perfect body, to every minute fragment of the eucharistic bread or form of bread, as to be eaten with it by every communicant; or whether they might not rather have used the word *spiritual* as

denoting the nature and character of the mode of presence, and as OPPOSED TO bodily presence instead of INCLUDING it. And if the latter be the sense in which they used the word, then, however ingenious and clever may be the contrivance by which their "spiritual presence" has been made to sanction the doctrine of the real presence of Christ's body in the form of a spirit, it must be admitted to represent their doctrine as precisely the opposite to what it really is.

Now, then, let us ask the question of one of these old divines, and one to whom we are constantly referred by our opponents in this matter, I mean Bishop Taylor, what he meant by the phrase, when he wrote a treatise in favor of the doctrine of a *real spiritual presence*. His answer is this:—

"Christ is present spiritually, *that is, by effect and blessing*."[1] "In the Sacrament is given us the true substance of Christ's body or flesh, but not carnally but spiritually; *that is, not to our mouths, but to our hearts;* not to be chewed by teeth, but to be *eaten by faith*."[2]

And the ingenious device by which our Authors and their friends are endeavouring to rob the present generation in our Church of its dearest birthright in the blood-bought orthodoxy of its faith, is a very old, and, it might have been supposed, stale device of the Romanists. Like most of the rest of the weapons in their armoury, it will be found safely stored in Bellarmine. And thus is it treated by our good Bishop just quoted, and I would beg the reader's special attention to the passage:—

"It is remarkable that Bellarmine, when he is stating this question (De Euch. lib. i. c. 2. reg. 3.) seems to say the same thing, for which he quotes the words of S. Bernard now mentioned; for he says, that Christ's body is there *truly*, *substantially*, *really*, but *not corporally;* nay, you may say, *spiritually*. AND NOW A MAN WOULD THINK WE HAD HIM SURE; BUT HIS NATURE IS LABILE AND SLIPPERY; YOU ARE NEVER THE NEARER FOR THIS. . . . . For he intends not, for all these fine words, that Christ's body is present spiritually, as the word is used in Scripture, and in all common notices of usual speaking; but *spiritually with him signifies after*

[1] Bp. J. TAYLOR, "Real Presence and Spiritual of Christ in the Blessed Sacrament," &c. ed. 14. p. 5.

[2] ID. ib. p. 13.

*the manner of spirits*, which, besides that it is a cousening the world in the manner of expression, is also *a direct folly and contradiction*, that a body should be substantially present, that is, with the nature of a body naturally, and yet be not as a body but as a spirit, with that manner of being with which a spirit is distinguished from a body. In vain therefore it is that he denies the carnal manner, and admits a spiritual, and ever after requires that we believe a carnal presence, even in the very manner. But this caution and exactness in the use of the word 'spiritual' is therefore carefully to be observed, lest the contention of both parties should seem trifling, and to be for nothing. We say that Christ's body is in the Sacrament *really*, but *spiritually*. They say it is there *really*, but *spiritually*. For so Bellarmine is bold to say, that the word may be allowed in this question. Where, now, is the difference? Here by 'spiritually' they mean, *present after the manner of a spirit;* by 'spiritually' WE MEAN, PRESENT TO OUR SPIRITS ONLY; that is, so as Christ is not present to any other sense but that of faith, or spiritual susception; but their way *makes his body to be present no way but that which is impossible and implies a contradiction; a body not after the manner of a body, a body like a spirit;* a body without a body; and a sacrifice of body and blood without blood: *corpus incorporeum, cruor incruentus.* They say that Christ's body is truly present there as it was upon the cross, but not after the manner of all or any body, but after that manner of being as an angel is in a place. That's their *spiritually*. But we by the *real spiritual presence* of Christ do understand, CHRIST TO BE PRESENT AS THE SPIRIT OF GOD IS PRESENT IN THE HEARTS OF THE FAITHFUL BY BLESSING AND GRACE; AND THIS IS ALL WHICH WE MEAN BESIDES THE TROPICAL AND FIGURATIVE PRESENCE." [1]

I quote no more, because every one knows that Bishop Taylor was neither a Zuinglian nor a Calvinist, except in the reproachful vocabulary of the Romanists.

I remark only that the reason for this device on the part of Bellarmine and the Romanists is, as in the case of others, obvious. He had to deal with passages in the Fathers which compelled him to use certain terms and phrases, and the only way in which he could reconcile those terms and phrases with his own doctrine was by putting upon them a non-natural interpretation.

[1] ID. ib. pp. 13—15. Other extracts to the same effect will be found in chap. 7, below.

The fourth sophism I notice is,—

(4.) The pretence of denying a corporal, and only holding a spiritual, presence.

Our Rubric having expressly excluded the doctrine of a "corporal" presence, it is absolutely necessary for the Authors under review to do the same, so far as *words* are concerned. They therefore assume that the word "corporal" in the Rubric means "material," and hence they argue that as they do not maintain that the body is present in a *material* form, but in the form of a spirit, they do not come under the condemnation of the Rubric. But it may reasonably be asked, why they limit the meaning of the term *corporal presence*, which is in fact *bodily presence*, in the Rubric, to a presence of the body in a *material* form, if there may be a bodily presence in the form of a spirit? *Corporal presence* means neither *more* nor *less* than *bodily presence*. And if there may be a *bodily presence* in the form of a spirit, there may be a *corporal presence* in the form of a spirit. And the Romanists and high Lutherans, who hold like our Authors only an immaterial form of presence, never dream of denying that it is a *corporal presence* that they hold. The object, therefore, of this palpable sophism is apparent. It is to escape the condemnation of the Rubric.

And by this artifice the door is opened to all sorts of quibbles and evasions, and misapplications of passages, both of antient and modern divines. If they are charged with maintaining that Christ's natural body is truly and properly eaten, they will reply, yes, but we mean not corporally, but only spiritually, and after a supernatural manner; and they will then bring numberless quotations from the Fathers and our old divines maintaining the eating of Christ's body spiritually by the communicants, and will forthwith assume the airs of those who are contending only for what "the Church Catholic" has always maintained, and who are misrepresented as advocating a corporal presence. But the mystery is at once cleared up when we come to know the different meaning attributed to the terms used. By the spiritual presence and the spiritual eating of Christ's body, *they* mean the real (and, though they object to the term, *local*) presence of Christ's body after the manner of a spirit, and the *oral*[1]

[1] If there were any attempt to deny that according to this doctrine the body of Christ is eaten by the mouth, it would be useless. For the body must either

eating of that body, so present, in or with or under the elements; but orthodox members of Christ's Holy Catholic Church attach, as we have seen, a very different meaning to the words.

The question between us is not as to words, but as to the doctrine meant by the words. We maintain a real spiritual presence of Christ's body and blood to the faithful communicant as much as they do. But as the body and blood of Christ are food for the soul only, so their presence is vouchsafed, primarily at least, only to the soul, and for this there is no need of local proximity. The soul may feed upon Christ by faith, and spiritually receive the body and blood of Christ for its nourishment, as well when that body is in heaven as if it was in the stomach. It is no more present to the soul in one case than in the other. The spiritual presence of Christ's body and blood to the soul is effected by that spiritual union and communion established between the two by the operation of the Divine Spirit accompanying the reception of the consecrated elements in the case of the faithful recipient, and making them effectual instruments for bringing about communion with the body and blood of Christ.

This *is* a presence of a *spiritual* kind, and not less *real* than any *local* or *bodily* presence. And the eating is as *real* as is that by the body. Bodily eating has its counterpart in the acts of the soul, and therefore, as we speak of eating by the mouth, so when referring to the acts of the spirit, we may speak of eating by the spirit. The first is corporal eating, the second spiritual eating; and that only which is material can be eaten corporally. But both are *real;* that is, not imaginary.

Another sophism that is sometimes resorted to in this matter,[1] is,

(5.) The objection, How can we eat Christ's body by faith?

This objection has not been expressly put forward, as far as I recollect, by the Authors under review; but it seems to me to be distinctly implied in their language, for they speak as if there could be no participation of Christ's body and blood but by an

be taken by the mouth or by faith, or (if they please to say so) by both. But the doctrine maintained is, that the wicked, who have *no faith*, eat it. Therefore they must eat it by the mouth.

It is objected to Jewel by Harding in his Answer to Jewel's "Apology," and well answered by Jewel in his "Defence of the Apology." Works, P. S. ed. vol. 3. pp. 486, 7.

oral eating of it; which is, in fact, the same thing in other words; though scarcely consistent with their own admissions elsewhere.

Now this question might well be returned, How else can we eat it? For, in the first place, if the Romanists and our Authors remained true to their professed doctrine of a literal interpretation of our Lord's words, the body of which we partake in the Eucharist is no Marcionite phantasm, but the true material body of Christ that suffered on the cross, and this material body is confessedly not present. How, then, can we eat of this body except through the acts of the soul by faith? And it is a serious liberty to take with our Lord's words, to say that the word *body*, as occurring in them, does not mean what men ordinarily understand by the word body. This is, indeed, to suppose that our Lord used words calculated to mislead.

But even taking their doctrine as it stands, though they maintain that our Lord's body is eaten with the bodily mouth, yet they are compelled by the express testimony both of Scripture and the Fathers to admit, that it is food only for the soul, and not for the body. "Faith is essential," says Archdeacon Wilberforce, "if the *res sacramenti* is to be the spiritual nourish-"ment of the soul .... The body of Christ .... does not and "cannot act directly upon our material structure .... Although "we may pray, therefore, that 'our sinful bodies may be made "clean by His Body,' as well as 'our souls washed by His most "precious Blood,' yet it is only through a spiritual process that "this work can be effected, and its medium must be a believing "heart."[1]

The Romanists say the same.

Consequently the question recurs, even according to their own system, How can we eat Christ's body by faith? All which they have gained by their system is, that they have brought Christ's body into the stomach, instead of leaving it at the right hand of God in heaven. And what advantage, I would ask, accrues to them from this? As I have already urged before, Is the soul better able to feed upon Christ's body when so placed, than if it was at the right hand of God in heaven? Is it more present to faith in the one case than it is in the other? Is it given to *the soul* more in one case than in the other?

[1] pp. 406, 407. 3rd ed. p. 350.

They have themselves, therefore, to seek an answer to this question.

For my own part, I think that the consideration of this question may tend to enable us to find our way through some difficulties that are often urged on this subject; and see how in such a case a thing may be *locally absent* and yet *really present;* the former phrase having reference to our bodies, the latter to our spirits.

When we speak of the soul eating, or of a thing being eaten by faith, it is obvious that we are using language derived from bodily acts, to describe, as far as we can, spiritual acts, or the acts of the soul. And therefore the expressions must be understood in a sense suitable to spiritual acts. The soul may be said to feed upon and eat the body of Christ by faith, because as the body takes and is nourished by the earthly elements, so the soul derives, by the exercise of faith, from the body of Christ,—communion with which is made to accompany the reception of the elements in the case of the faithful,—new powers of life; and there is a spiritual union and communion established between Christ and the believer, so that, in a spiritual sense, there is a real presence of Christ to the believer's soul; but for this there is no need of a local presence of our Lord's body. In fact, the local presence of the body would not aid the effect contemplated, because the soul could not be supposed to take into itself our Lord's body, even though that body were in the form of a spirit. It is no imaginary act that I am here speaking of, nor any mere mental contemplation of a thing far distant. There is an act of grace on the part of Christ, as well as an act of faith on the part of the believer. His body and blood are made present, and, as it were, seen, felt, and tasted by the soul. A spiritual union is effected by which their virtue and efficacy are communicated to it. There is a real presence, therefore, of a spiritual kind through the power of God, notwithstanding the local absence; just as the root of a tree is really present to its topmost twig, notwithstanding its local absence. And the participation of the Holy Communion may be looked upon as an application, as it were, to the root and source of all vital influence, for a fresh supply of that virtue from Christ the Head, by which the spiritual life of all the members of his mystical body is maintained.

And this is the only way in which the soul *can* eat anything. It would be absurd to suppose that it could receive into itself or contain Christ's body. The admission that Christ's body is food only for the soul ought at once to exclude all notion of oral eating, and to show those who make it that the terms used must be interpreted consistently with the nature and acts of the spiritual part of man.

And it is marvellous, when we consider how often such language is made use of in Holy Scripture, that any difficulty should arise as to its meaning. For instance, when our Lord said to the woman of Samaria, "If thou knewest the gift of God, &c., thou wouldest have asked of him, and he would have given thee *living water;*" and again, "Whosoever drinketh of this water "shall thirst again, but whosoever drinketh of the water that I "shall give him, shall never thirst, but the water that I shall give "him shall be in him a well of water springing up into ever-"lasting life,"—no one now would think of imagining with the woman of Samaria, that it was real water of which our Lord spake, or that He referred to any *oral* drinking of something locally present, so as to be received into the mouth.

Again; another sophism is,—

(6.) That the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper consists of an outward sign and the thing signified joined together; and if all do not receive the thing signified, there must be some of the communicants who do not receive the sacrament.

This is a favorite argument with Archdeacon Denison. He says,—

"If the Gift be not received at all in the case of those who 'receive unworthily,' then in their case there is *no sacrament:* for let either the inward part or the outward part be taken away, or cease to be, and *the sacrament* is destroyed. If it be a different thing that is received by those who 'receive unworthily,' from that which is received by those who 'receive worthily,' then in their case there is a different sacrament: *i. e.* the doctrine is taught of two kinds of sacraments, and not one—two Holy Baptisms—two Holy Communions." [1]

"All who receive the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, receive the Body and Blood of Christ. If any do not, then, in their case, a sacrament is not a sacrament." [2]

[1] Serm. 1. p. 33.

[2] Serm. 2. p. 131.

Now, so far as concerns *the verbal difficulty* thus raised, the Archdeacon himself gives us the means of answering him. For he is compelled to admit, that "When we distinguish, for the "purposes of teaching, between the 'sacramentum,' the 'res "sacramenti,' and the 'virtus' or 'gratia sacramenti'—which "is the distinction made in our Catechism—1. 'the outward "part or sign.' 2. 'the inward part or thing signified.' 3. 'the "benefits whereof we are partakers thereby'—in that case the "word 'sacramentum' is confined to 'the outward part or "sign.'"[1] And he tells us that these distinctions were suggested by Augustine, who used the word "sacramentum" to signify "the outward part or sign."[2]

He admits, therefore, that there are two senses of the word "sacrament," one in which it stands for "the outward and visible sign," and another in which it represents the rite as consisting of the gift given by God as well as of the part conferred by man.

Consequently, by his own showing, if any do not receive the inward part or thing signified by the sacrament, they may yet receive the sacrament in the former sense of the word. For although he may think that the two are always so connected together actually, that he who receives the "sacramentum" receives with it *the thing signified by it*, yet nevertheless he cannot deny, that as these are two things and not one, separable, though they may not be actually separated, he who received the former without the latter must be admitted to have received *the sacrament*. For he grants that "the outward part or sign" is called both by Augustine and our Church *the sacrament*, and therefore he cannot deny that he who receives the former receives the latter. The verbal part of the difficulty therefore is soon removed.

Let us proceed to what may be called the theological part of the difficulty. The argument here would be, that as there are two parts in a sacrament, taking the word sacrament in the second sense, he who received only one would not have received the sacrament.

Now, in this larger sense of the word sacrament, I quite admit, and maintain, that those who do not come with a right disposition of mind have not that part of the sacrament which

[1] Serm. 2. p. 101. [2] Ibid. p. 124.

comes from God. So far as concerns what is given by man, they receive the sacrament. Man gives the outward and visible part or sign, and *that* they receive. God intended the rite to consist of two parts, and therefore it is justly said to consist properly of two parts. But God never intended this holy rite to be profaned by men coming to it with wicked minds, and from them therefore He withholds that part which comes from Him. Of this, however, we know nothing; at least we have no right to judge to whom He gives it or from whom He withholds it; and therefore even in this *larger sense* of the word "sacrament," we deal with all communicants as having received it.

But I must go further than this in replying to this sophism, and maintain that our Authors themselves, though they insist so much on the necessity of holding that all communicants receive the inward part or thing signified, together with the outward, do not themselves consistently carry out this view. For while they contend for the bodily reception of it by all, they are compelled to admit that in the case of the wicked the reception terminates with the body, and does not affect the soul; while, nevertheless, they also confess that Christ's body is food only for the soul. The bodily reception, therefore, for which they contend amounts to nothing. It is in fact equivalent to no reception at all, because the body is not the part for which the body of Christ is intended for food. As I have already observed in a former page, it is no more a reception of the Body of Christ than food taken into the dress is a reception of that food by the body of man.

Nay, more; according to the doctrine of our Church, following that of Antiquity, the two parts of the sacrament in this larger sense are the outward and visible sign and the inward spiritual grace; and not, as our Authors represent the matter, the outward sign and the thing signified by it. And both Archdeacon Wilberforce[1] and Archdeacon Denison[2] admit, that the grace of the sacrament is not received by the wicked. Archdeacon Wilberforce speaks of the *gratia* or *virtus sacramenti* as "its effect on the devout soul."[3] And if they did not admit it, it would necessarily follow from their doctrine. For, as it is

[1] Pp. 119, 120, and 222, 223. 3rd ed. pp. 101, 102, and 190, 191.
[2] Serm. 1. p. 39. Serm. 2. pp. 101 and 124, &c.
[3] P. 223. 3rd ed. p. 191.

admitted, that Christ's Body is food only for the soul,—the *virtus sacramenti* not being receivable by the body, except through the soul,—and that the soul can only receive or feed upon that Body by faith, the grace of the sacrament cannot be said to be communicated to the wicked.

Consequently, according to their own doctrine, the sacrament in this larger sense is not received by the wicked.

Another favorite sophism is,—

(7.) That a sufficient reply to all objections is that God is Omnipotent.

But this I have already noticed in a former page,[1] and shown, I trust, that the truth of God's Omnipotence is not called in question by a denial of the doctrine of our Authors.

I conclude with a notice of the sophisms and fallacies that lie hid under,—

(8.) The frequent use of phrases that bear two senses, and the misapplication of passages from our great divines containing such phrases, for the purpose of proving doctrine opposed to the manifest views of their authors.

From the peculiar character of the subject a wide door is open for sophisms and fallacies of various kinds, especially in connexion with the phraseology employed. The difference of meaning in which the same phrases may be used, tends greatly to mislead and confuse the reader; and a skilful disputant may, if he pleases, entangle an inexperienced reader in endless perplexities by a dexterous use of terms, and appear to be only maintaining the same doctrine which divines have asserted, who nevertheless did in reality write in defence of entirely different doctrine. In fact, on this subject passages might be quoted from Bellarmine, Luther, Calvin, Zuinglius, that is, from authors of all the different schools that ever existed in this matter, as to the presence of Christ in the Eucharist, and the eating and drinking of his body and blood; and if they were all put together without the names of their authors, or anything to indicate who uttered the words, no one could be sure who wrote them. Hence the facility with which a "Catena" may be drawn up in favor of any view, from the writings of authors totally opposed to that view. And hence clearly the confusion that has so largely pre-

[1] See pp. 155, 156; 157; 172; above.

vailed recently in the public mind upon the question whether the doctrine of the Authors under review is consistent with the doctrine maintained by our Reformers and great Divines. And I believe that one great object to be kept in view by any writer who would wish to guide the public mind to the truth on this subject is, to clear away this source of misconception.

Do the Authors under review maintain a change in the elements after consecration? It is easy to find passages in our great divines asserting such a change.

Do they maintain a real presence of Christ in the Eucharist? Numberless passages may be brought from our old divines which do the same.

Do they maintain a real eating and drinking of the body and blood of Christ? So did Cranmer, Jewel, and all their worthy successors in our Church.

Do they guard their doctrine by the limitation that it is only a "spiritual presence," a "sacramental presence," or "sacramental union," for which they contend? What more, some will be disposed to say, can you require of them?

But any one acquainted with the different way in which these phrases are used on the subject, will know that it is utterly impossible to judge from the use of these words what the doctrine of an author is.

Let us examine the different meanings of which they are susceptible.

Thus, as to the question, whether the elements are or are not changed after consecration. In one sense they are, in another they are not. In *character* and *use* they are, in *nature* and *essence* and *condition* they are not. The phrase, therefore, may be used so as entirely to mystify the reader, and passages quoted from authors who have used the phrase in one sense to support doctrine connected with a very different sense of the words.

Again, as to the phrase "real presence in the Eucharist." Our Authors use this phrase as if it had no other meaning but a real *bodily* presence of Christ *in the eucharistic elements*. But our old divines who used these words used them in a totally different sense. They never supposed the body of Christ to be given to the elements.

So as to the real eating and drinking of the body and blood of Christ. The notion connected by our Authors with these words is, an *oral* eating and drinking of Christ's real body and blood; and as they dare not maintain them to be *materially* present, they have been driven to the fiction of a real presence of that body and blood in a *spiritual* or *immaterial* form. But these words are also used by our old divines, and the doctrine contained in them urged as most important. Are we to conclude that their doctrine was the same as that of our Authors? Hasty and superficial readers often judge it to be so, especially if they satisfy themselves with the evidence of a few quotations. But the moment the works of these authors are fairly read, the delusion is dissipated. The body they hold to be eaten is, as Cranmer expresses it, Christ's "true natural and organical flesh," and their notion of the real eating is *the soul's eating by faith*, which is not less *real* than the mouth's eating by the bodily organs, though of a different kind.

The phrases *spiritual presence*, and *sacramental presence* or *union*, are still more calculated to perplex the reader. But when it is recollected that the Romanists themselves use these phrases as much as we do,[1] that fact alone will show the reader how utterly impossible it is to judge from their use what is the real doctrine of the writer who employs them.

The "spiritual presence" of our Authors is the presence of a body as a spirit; which is an absurdity and self-contradiction; widely different from what our old divines meant by that term, as I have already shown.[2] And the term *sacramental presence* is used by each writer to express that presence which he supposes to exist in the Sacrament, and therefore is altogether without any fixed meaning.

Nothing, therefore, is more necessary in this matter than a clear understanding of the precise meaning in which certain terms are used by the Authors whom we are perusing, and a fixed use of them in our own mind; otherwise there is no end to the confusion in which we shall be involved.

Such are some of the *arguments* by which the unsoundness of the doctrine of the Authors under review is manifested, and

[1] See pp. 160, 161; 169, 170; 212; above. [2] See pp. 212, 213, above.

such the *sophisms* and *fallacies* upon which it rests. Others might have been added, had it been necessary. But I am quite willing to leave the impartial reader to judge from those adduced how far the doctrine in question has a claim upon his belief.

In doing so, I am not constituting man's reason as the judge what he is to believe of things that are revealed in matters beyond his power fully to comprehend. I take it for granted here, that the previous chapter has shown that the doctrine in question is not taught in Holy Scripture. And I follow up the evidence there given to that effect, by endeavouring to show in this chapter that it is not merely *above* but *contrary to* reason, and that the arguments by which it is supported are of a very weak and sophistical nature. Here the province of reason properly comes in; and we may justly make the same appeal as the Apostle,—"I speak as to wise men, judge ye what I say."

# CHAPTER V.

## THE TESTIMONY OF THE FATHERS.

---

### SECTION I.

#### PRELIMINARY REMARKS.

I PROCEED to consider the testimony of the Fathers on the subject of this work. And in so doing I would recall to the reader's recollection the precise nature of the points in dispute. We are not now occupied with the particular doctrine of Transubstantiation. *That* mode of the Real Presence is rejected by Archdeacon Denison and Dr. Pusey, and is not *advocated* by Archdeacon Wilberforce in the works now under review. The notion of Transubstantiation is only *one of the forms* in which the doctrine here opposed presents itself to us. The doctrine now under consideration, is that of a real substantial presence of the body and blood of Christ on earth in the Eucharist, in a spiritual form, to be received into the mouths of the communicants. What we are about to inquire in this chapter, therefore, is this, Whether the Fathers held such an objective presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in, with, or under the consecrated bread and wine, or under their forms, as to make with them one conjoined whole; so that that Body and Blood are really and substantially, though in a spiritual and immaterial form, received into the mouths of the communicants.

And with this is connected the question, Whether they held, that the wicked who have no faith eat and drink the Body and Blood of Christ.

I fully agree with Archdeacon Denison, that where such an objective presence is maintained, there, in common consistency, the latter doctrine must be maintained, and *vice versa*. And, therefore, if either doctrine is repudiated by the Fathers, that will go a long way to prove that the other is also rejected. But I shall consider them distinctly.

The evidence which I am about to urge against the affirmative view of this question, will of course apply to the doctrine of Transubstantiation, but it will also take a wider range, and include all notions of a real bodily presence, so joined to the elements as to form one compound whole with them.

The two special points, then, which I shall endeavour to prove are these:—

First, That the Fathers, generally, did *not* hold, that the real Body and Blood of Christ, in *any* form, are so joined to the consecrated bread and wine, or so exist under their forms, that they are received into the mouths of the communicants; but that the mode of reception is spiritual, that is, by *the soul* or spirit, the *sole* mean by which they are *received* being faith.

Secondly, That the Fathers, generally, held, that the wicked, who have no faith, do *not* eat and drink the real Body and Blood of Christ; but only the Sacramental Body and Blood of Christ, *i. e.*, the sacred symbols and representatives of them.

I must again remind the reader, before I proceed, that neither a real presence nor a real manducation of the Body of Christ in the Supper is denied, if the words are understood in that sense which the subject demands; though the way in which such terms have been abused for the furtherance of false doctrine renders them objectionable. The manducation of Christ's Body by faith is as *real* a manducation as the mouth's manducation of the bread, though of a different, that is, a spiritual kind. And the presence of Christ's Body, remaining in heaven, to the soul of the believer on earth, to be fed upon by his faith, and for the spiritual nourishment of his soul, is as real as the presence of the bread to the mouth of the communicant.

But with the authors of the works under review, all who deny the reception of Christ's body by the mouth with the elements are set down as denying *any* real presence or recep-

tion of Christ's Body. A denial of this oral manducation of Christ's Body, however, is quite consistent with the maintenance of a real spiritual manducation of it; as may appear even from the following statement of a writer of one of the Reformed Churches abroad, in a work written in reply principally to the Lutherans, and which, though I do not quote it as pledging myself to all the views and expressions which may occur in it, as a work written by one of another communion, seems in the paragraph I am about to quote to illustrate and confirm very clearly what I have just stated. He says,—

"Therefore we neither deny the presence nor the manducation of the Body of Christ in the Supper, but the controversy between us and our adversaries is only on the *manner* of the presence and manducation.[1] For when they urge in the words of the Supper, the phrase used, and the literal meaning of it, we say that the language is sacramental, and consequently define the manner of the presence also, and of the manducation to be sacramental; which not even they can deny. But when we explain it after the nature and condition of other sacraments, our adversaries do not assent to this conclusion, but demand something more. But the sacred Scriptures teach (and in this we agree on both sides) that the manducation of the body of Christ is twofold, sacramental and spiritual. That is called sacramental, in which with our bodily mouth we take the symbols, the bread and wine, which are *called by the names of the things signified, to wit, the Body and Blood of Christ.* And this is that manducation by which the orthodox Fathers say, that the Body of Christ is eaten by us in a mystery and in a sacrament, and oppose to it the truth of the Body. The spiritual manducation is that in which we partake of and eat, not only the external signs, but whole Christ, God and Man with all his benefits, not with the mouth of the body, but of the mind, which is faith. Respecting both these kinds of manducation there is a sufficient agreement between us, although some incorrectly charge us with teaching a spiritual manducation of such a kind, as that not the Body of Christ but only its merit and efficacy is partaken of. But that these persons misrepresent us, the books and confessions published by those on our side sufficiently show. For since we teach that there is by faith a spiritual and life-giving manducation, we embrace by that same faith not only the benefits

[1] From the use of these expressions by the author here cited, we may estimate the value of the argument raised by some among us from the use of such expressions by Bishop Andrews and others to prove that they held *their* doctrine of the Real Presence.

and merit of Christ, but whole Christ with all his gifts. For we are not ignorant, that that ineffable communion, by which we are united to Christ, is placed in this, that we are members of Christ, and he himself our Head, from whom life and salvation is communicated to his members. Therefore the controversy between us is only respecting this, Whether besides the sacramental and spiritual manducation, a certain third kind of manducation is laid down in those words, 'This is my Body,' in which the very substance of the Body of Christ is manducated with the bodily mouth," &c.[1]

This is the kernel of the controversy between us and the authors under review. We maintain, with them, a *sacramental* eating of the Body of Christ by *all;* but we take leave to use the word *sacramental* in a different, and, as we conceive, more proper sense than that which they affix to it. We agree with them as to a *spiritual* eating of it by the faithful to their souls' health. But we differ from them as to the *oral* eating of that Body by the communicants. We do not hold, that the Body and Blood of Christ are so joined to the consecrated Bread and Wine as to form one compound or conjoined whole with them, so that when the latter are put into the mouth, the mouth also receives with them the former.

The views of Archdeacon Denison on this point have received a further confirmation during the progress of this work through the press, by his publication of a MS. treatise of Saravia,[2] on the subject of the Eucharist,[3] which he found in the British Museum. This treatise, manifestly intended for publication, was presented by Saravia to James I., but instead of being published, remained ever after on the shelves of the Royal Library. What evidence, therefore, such a treatise can afford, that the doctrine inculcated in it is that of the Church of England, it is difficult to see. The contrary seems rather to follow from the fact of its non-publication. And when we come to look into the Treatise, we find the author altogether passing over the Articles of our Church, and informing the

[1] Heredesiani Consensus Orthodoxus de sent. et ver. verb. Cœnæ Domini; in Præf. Apol. ad Eccles. German. prope finem. Ed. Tigur. 1605. fol.

[2] Adrian Saravia was born in Flanders, and became a minister of the Reformed Church in Holland, but afterwards came over to this country and held preferment in our Church. He died in 1612.

[3] Saravia on the Holy Eucharist. The original Latin from the MS. in the British Museum, &c. The translation by G. A. Denison, &c. Lond. 1855. 8vo.

King in his "Dedication," that he "*resumes the matter at that point at which it stood in* 1536." But nevertheless the Archdeacon states, that in the publication of this work "his purpose "has been to call attention to the fact, that many great divines "of the Church of England have, in their writings, at the time "of the Reformation as before and since, *maintained the precise "teaching, which is now charged against him as false doctrine "and a depravation of the Articles.*"

The following extracts, then, from this work will serve additionally to illustrate the "precise" nature of Archdeacon Denison's "teaching":—

"Just as by virtue of that intimate personal union of those two natures [in Christ], there ariseth an interchange and communion of their natural properties, and God is truly said to be man, and in like manner man is truly said to be God; so, by virtue of the sacramental conjunction, the bread is said to be the Flesh of Christ, and the Flesh of Christ is said to be bread. For just as the Person of Christ consisteth of God and man, that is, of the Divine and human nature, so the Sacrament of the Eucharist consisteth of the Flesh of the Lord and of bread, of the Blood and wine; because everything which, being compounded of divers things, becometh one by union or conjunction, containeth within itself the nature and truth of those things whereof it is compounded." [1]

So that the union between the bread and wine and the Body and Blood of Christ is like the union between the Divine and human natures in the one Person of Christ!

And the reception of the Body and Blood of Christ by the mouth is constantly insisted upon.

"How doth another sin who believeth the love of Christ the Lord to be so great towards us, that He willeth to be present with his Body in his mysteries; and in a Divine, spiritual, heavenly and supernatural manner to *enter the roof of our mouth*, that so his Body present may fill with his Deity the whole man?" [2]

"The same Lord who now, by the hands of his ministers, distributeth from heaven his Body and his Blood to his faithful people, in the Last Supper with his own hands gave himself to his apostles; and as then the manner of the presence of his Body, as it lay at the Last Supper, was one, and the manner of his presence in the sacrament, and *in the mouth of him who ate*, was another; in like manner at this day there is one manner of presence of the Body of Christ in

[1] p. 57. I quote from the Archdeacon's own translation. [2] pp. 31, 33.

heaven, there is another in the form of bread and wine; but in both cases it is a real and true manner,—in the one case one, and in the other case another,—although there be no difference between that which is given on earth, and that which is nevertheless in heaven." [1]

He describes "the sacrament" thus:—

"The sacrament is the bread and the body and the wine and the blood. He who receiveth only the bread, receiveth no sacrament; for either the sacrament is received whole and perfect, or not at all." [2] "The sacrament is compounded from the bread and the flesh of Christ." [3]

And having described "the sacrament" as consisting of these two things, he tells us,—

"The same sacrament, *the whole sacrament*, robbed of no part of itself, *is in the mouth of all, good and bad;* the same outward thing equally sacred and divine in all cases is, together with the inward and heavenly thing, that is, the flesh and blood of Christ, given to and received by the good and the bad alike." [4]

Among the passages quoted by the Archdeacon in the "Appendix" to this work, in further illustration and confirmation of his views, is the following from Luther:—

"I look upon them all as of one class, whoever they may be, who will not believe that the Lord's bread in the Sacred Supper is his *true natural body*, which the godless man or a Judas, as much even as a St. Peter or any other saint *receives into his mouth*." [5]

What part the teeth perform when the Body of Christ is thus in the mouth, the Archdeacon does not tell us. Perhaps he adopts the prudent judgment of Cardinal Bellarmine, that "as to the manner of the manducation, bruising is not neces-
"sary, but the reception is enough, and the transmission from
"the mouth to the stomach by the human and natural instru-
"ments, that is, the tongue and the palate." [6]

The Archdeacon, with characteristic imprudence, quotes from Dr. Munchmeyer's Essay on the doctrine of the visible and invisible Chruch, the following remark on this subject:—

"In the controversy with the Reformed on the subject of the Lord's Supper, the question 'What do the ungodly receive?' was

[1] p. 37. [2] p. 89. [3] p. 93. [4] p. 105. [5] p. 208.

[6] Ad rationem manducationis, non est necessaria attritio, sed satis est sumptio, et transmissio ab ore ad stomachum per instrumenta humana et naturalia, id est, linguam et palatum. BELLARM. De Euchar. lib. 1. c. 11. Op. Col. Agr. 1619. tom. iii. col. 438, 9.

the shibboleth of the two parties. Then the Lutherans with the Romanists answered: *They too receive the true Body and the true Blood of the Lord.*" [1]

Nothing could be more true. This question *was* the "shibboleth" of the Lutherans with the Romanists on one side, and the Reformed Churches, *among which our own was always considered at that time as holding a conspicuous place,* on the other. And the Archdeacon has ranked himself with *the former.*

On the particular subject of this Chapter, that is, the doctrine of the Fathers on the Eucharist, the Archdeacon has not entered. He has left that part of the discussion to Archdeacon Wilberforce and Dr. Pusey, with the exception of a few references to Augustine, which I shall notice hereafter.

Dr. Pusey, however, in a volume which has appeared while this work is passing through the press, has put together a large collection of passages from the Fathers, intended to show their maintenance of *his* doctrine of the Real Presence.[2] To a portion of this work, namely that which is devoted to a proof that the Fathers did not hold the doctrine of Transubstantiation, I can of course have no objection.

His remarks respecting *Consubstantiation* appear to me to affect only a question of *name,* not a *reality.* He objects very strongly to the word "consubstantiation" being used to express the doctrine of the real Body and Blood of Christ being supposed to exist in a state of conjunction with the elements; inasmuch as consubstantiation means the blending of two substances into one substance; and he thinks that "co-existence" would have been a more proper term to use in this matter.[3] For my own part I have no objection to the use of the term "co-existence" if Dr. Pusey prefers it, but I think that, of the two, "consubstantiation" is a better word to describe the nature of the doctrine referred to. That the bread and wine and the Body and Blood of Christ *co-exist,* no one is disposed to dispute. The question is, whether the substance of Christ's Body and the substance of Christ's Blood co-exist with the bread and wine in one compound whole, such that if the former are received

[1] p. 205.

[2] The doctrine of the Real Presence as contained in the Fathers, &c vindicated in Notes on a Sermon, &c. Oxf. and Lond. 1855. 8vo.

[3] p. 2.

into the mouth, the latter are so at the same time. And to describe a doctrine of this kind, the word "consubstantiation" seems a more appropriate term than "co-existence." And I do not find Dr. Johnson finding fault with the word as so applied, but interpreting it as meaning "the union of the Body of our Blessed Saviour with the sacramental element according to the Lutherans," and referring to Bishop Atterbury as using it in this sense.

It is quite true that the Lutherans reject the term, as Dr. Pusey has done; and hence Dr. Pusey tells us, that "consubstantiation was not held by the Lutheran body." (p. 32.) But the sole question is, in what sense the word "consubstantiation" is used; and Dr. Pusey must be well aware that those who have written against the Lutherans as holding the doctrine of "Consubstantiation" have used the term to express the doctrine which the Lutherans admit that they hold; and until Dr. Pusey can give us some better term than "co-existence" to use in its place, I suspect that it will still hold its ground.

Of the rest of the volume, that part which alone is devoted to any direct evidence on the subject before us is the last Note, which however occupies more than half the volume, and is set apart for a list of passages in favor (as Dr. Pusey considers) of the doctrine of "the Real Objective Presence in the Holy Eucharist." But how, as it respects a large proportion of these passages, Dr. Pusey himself could suppose, that they convey any proof that their authors held this doctrine, it is difficult to imagine. The whole evidence in the case of almost all of them seems to lie in the fact, that in speaking of the consecrated elements, they apply to them the terms—*the Body and Blood of Christ*. But, as I shall show presently, this fact proves nothing. No one denies that those terms may properly, in a certain sense, be applied to them. And further, in some of these passages, it is only a modification of those names that is applied to them. For instance, Dr. Pusey quotes the Council of Carthage, where the phrase is, "the eucharist of the Body of Christ." (p. 598.) Moreover, as it respects many of the passages, Dr. Pusey himself must admit, that the language is highly figurative, as for instance where it speaks of "*the blood that hath reddened thy tongue*" (p. 567); and many similar passages might be added.

What is wanted for Dr. Pusey's purpose is, not a collection

of passages of this general kind, in which the benefits of the Eucharist are set forth with all that rhetorical ardour of language in which most of the Fathers so much delight, and the consecrated elements are, for the sake of reverence and honor, spoken of, as all are willing to speak of them, as, in a certain signification,—*quodam modo,* as Augustine says,—the Body and Blood of Christ; but something definite and distinct, which clearly involves the doctrine of a real objective presence in or with the Bread and Wine. The object of such language as that used by the Fathers is manifest, especially when it occurs in their Liturgical Services; namely, to take off the minds of the people from the sensible elements, and to fix them on those things which they represent.

Especially do we need an answer to those passages in the same Fathers in which expressions are used which do *not* seem reconcileable with the notion of such a presence. As for instance when any Father tells us, that, as it respects the presence of his *body,* Christ is absent from the earth, how are we to suppose that the same Father held, that a real presence of Christ's body is daily vouchsafed in thousands of places on the earth?

And in this chapter my especial object will be to produce these passages, as the best proof that such language as that which Dr. Pusey has quoted, was not intended to be understood in the sense which he has affixed to it. And at the close of the chapter, when reviewing more particularly the language of certain of the antient Fathers, I shall notice some of the extracts which Dr. Pusey has cited from them.

The argument which Archdeacon Wilberforce has raised from the writings of the Fathers, I shall also reply to in the latter end of this chapter.

But my first object will be, to point out under a series of distinct heads, involving essential points in the controversy, the views of the Fathers on the subject before us. In the case of a doctrine like that now under consideration, in which the same words and phrases may be used in various different senses, the best way to reach the views of any writer on the subject is, to *test them on certain points, the maintenance of which is inconsistent with the maintenance of the doctrine in question.* I shall inquire therefore what the Fathers have said on various points inconsistent with a

belief in the doctrine ascribed to them in the works under review. And I shall add testimonies of a more direct kind on the subject.

There is one caution only which I would premise before proceeding to consider their testimonies, and that is one which all must allow to be a just one, and one to which all are obliged more or less to resort; namely, that from the circumstances of their times, the Fathers spoke with less care and precision than subsequent errors and heresies would have rendered necessary at a later period. Phrases may be used by them in the most orthodox sense, both in this and other subjects, which in later periods of the Church have been misused for the maintenance of false doctrine. And there is no other subject on which it is so easy to quote passages from an author, maintaining apparently the very reverse of the doctrine he really held, as in that now before us; on account of the different way in which the same phraseology has been applied.

And further it is quite needless to undertake to defend all the phrases used by the Fathers on this or any other subject. What we want is substantial testimony as to the views of some of the chief doctors of the antient Church on certain leading points of the doctrine in question, and from this testimony we must judge of their sentiments on the subject.

And as it concerns a difference of language, in some respects, in the case of those moderns who hold our views, from that which was often adopted by the Fathers, the remarks of our own Bishop Bilson (a Tractarian referee) are very just and pertinent. He says,—

"There are reasons why we do not think ourselves bound to take up the frequent use of their terms in that point, as we see you [*i.e.* the Romanists] do. For *first*, they be such words as Christ and his Apostles did forbear, and therefore our faith may stand without them. *Next*, they be dark and obscure speeches wholly depending on the nature and signification of sacraments, which the simple do hardly conceive. *Thirdly*, we find by experience before our eyes, how their phrases have entangled your senses, whiles you greedily pursued the words, and omitted the rules which should have mollified and directed the letter. These causes make us the warier and the willinger to keep to the words of the Holy Ghost, though the Father's applications, if you therewithal take their ex-

positions, do but in other terms teach that which we receive and confess to be true and sincere." [1]

Similar remarks are made by Bishop Cosin, which I shall quote in a subsequent page. [2]

I shall now place before the reader some extracts from the Fathers on various points, illustrating more or less directly their view on the point in question; and in offering a few passages from their works on each of these heads, I leave the reader to judge for himself how far they may be taken as representing the opinion of the Fathers *as a body*. They who are accustomed to quote the testimony of three or four Fathers as a sufficient proof of the judgment of Antiquity on a point, are bound to estimate accordingly the passages here cited. But in the case of others, these passages will certainly show the view of the individual writers, and therefore at least prove, that the contrary view is *not* the judgment of the early Church as a whole; which is all that I care to establish.

And after having given the direct testimonies to be found in the works of the Fathers in favor of the doctrine for which I am contending, I shall proceed to consider the supposed adverse evidence adduced by the authors under review, and such Patristical testimony as requires explanation.

## SECTION II.

### THE DIRECT TESTIMONY OF THE FATHERS IN FAVOR OF THE DOCTRINE MAINTAINED IN THIS WORK.

It is to be observed, that,—

(1.) *The Fathers tell us, that what our Lord gave to his disciples was bread and wine.*

Thus, Clement of Alexandria most distinctly says,—

"On this account, therefore, the Saviour, having first taken bread, spoke and gave thanks; then, having broken *the bread*, he placed it before them." [3]

[1] Bilson's Difference between Christian Subjection and Unchristian Rebellion &c. Oxf. 1585, 4to, pp. 701, 702.

[2] Cosin's Hist. of Transubst. ed. 1840, pp. 147—53.

[3] Διὰ τοῦτο οὖν ὁ Σωτὴρ, ἄρτον λαβὼν πρῶτον, ἐλάλησεν καὶ εὐχαρίστησεν· εἶτα κλάσας τὸν ἄρτον προέθηκεν. Clem. Alex. Strom. lib. i. § 10. Op. ed. Potter. Oxon. 1715. tom. i. p. 343.

And again,—

"But that that which was blessed was *wine*, he again showed, saying to his disciples, 'I will not drink of the fruit of this vine, until,' &c." [1]

Here the words quoted by him show, that he is referring to the wine in its state *after consecration*.

Thus, also, Origen says, that Christ "gave bread to his disciples after having blessed and broken it;" [2] and in another place he speaks of "the bread which our Lord gave to his disciples, saying, Take, eat, &c." [3]

Chrysostom says, that Christ "gave wine when he gave this sacrament (or, mystery)." [4]

Cyril of Alexandria says, that Christ "gave bread to those that believed on him, after having broken it." [5]

The same conclusion is involved in the following passage of Augustine,—

"How many even now in the Supper itself, although they have not seen that table which then was [*i. e.* the table at which our Lord presided], nor seen with their eyes, or tasted with their jaws *the bread which the Lord carried in his hands*, yet inasmuch as that which is now prepared is the same, how many even now, in the Supper itself, eat and drink damnation to themselves!" [6]

What, therefore, our Lord carried in his hands, and gave to his disciples to eat, was *bread*.

And it must be observed, that, in these passages, the bread

[1] Ὅτι δὲ οἶνος ἦν τὸ εὐλογηθὲν, ἀπέδειξε πάλιν, πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς λέγων· Οὐ μὴ πίω ἐκ τοῦ γεννήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου ταύτης, μέχρις κ. τ. λ. ID. Pædag. lib. ii. c. 2. ib. p. 186.

[2] Δίδωσι τὸν ἄρτον εὐλογήσας καὶ κλάσας τοῖς μαθηταῖς. ORIG. Comment. in Matth. xvi. 7. Op. ed. cit. tom. iii. p. 720.

[3] Nam et Dominus panem, quem discipulis dabat, et dicebat eis, 'Accipite et manducate,' non distulit, nec servari jussit in crastinum. ID. In Levit. hom. v. § 7. Op. tom. ii. p. 211.

[4] Ἡνίκα τὰ μυστήρια παρέδωκεν, οἶνον παρέδωκε. CHRYS. In Matth. hom. 82. Op. ed. cit. tom. vii. p. 784.

[5] Τοῖς γὰρ ἤδη πεπιστευκόσι διακλάσας τὸν ἄρτον ἐδίδου, λέγων, κ.τ. λ. CYRILL. ALEX. In Joann. lib. iv. Op. ed. Aub. Paris. 1638. tom. iv. p. 360.

[6] Quam multi et modo in ipsa cœna, quamvis illam tunc mensam non viderint, nec panem quem Dominus gestavit in manibus oculis suis adspexerint, vel faucibus gustaverint, tamen quia ipsa est quæ nunc præparatur, quam multi etiam nunc in ipsa cœna judicium sibi manducant et bibunt! AUGUST. Serm. 112. § 4. Op. ed. sec. Benedict. Antw. 1700. tom. v. col. 394.

and wine are spoken of, not as *a portion* only of what our Lord gave to his disciples, but as *the thing* which he gave; the sacramental substances or entities which he administered. The Fathers do not speak of them as being given *with* Christ's body and blood; for

(2.) *They speak of that which is called the Lord's Body in the Eucharist as being* BREAD, *and that which is called his Blood as being* WINE.

Thus Tertullian, in two different places:—"Christ calls bread his body."[1]

Thus Irenæus:—"Taking bread, he witnessed it to be his body, and the mixture of the cup he affirmed to be his blood."[2] And again,—"The cup which is of that creature which is customary among us he testified to be his blood."[3] And again,—"The bread over which thanks are given is the Body of the Lord."[4]

Thus Cyprian:—"The Lord calls bread his body," and "calls wine his blood."[5] And again, very expressly,—"*It was wine that he called his blood.*"[6] And again,—"The cup of the Lord is not water only, or wine only, but a mixture of both; and in like manner neither can *the Body of the Lord* be *meal alone*, or *water alone*, but *both united and joined together and compacted into one bread.*"[7] And he speaks of a person being ashamed to use wine in the communion in the morning, "lest by the odour of the wine he may smell of the blood of Christ."[8]

[1] Christus panem corpus suum appellans. TERTULL. Adv. Jud. c. 10. Op. ed. Par. 1664. fol. p. 196: and Adv. Marc. lib. iii. c. 19. ib. p. 408.

[2] Accipiens panem suum corpus esse confitebatur, et temperamentum calicis suum sanguinem confirmavit. IREN. Adv. hæres. lib. iv. c. 33. § 2. ed. Mass. Paris. p. 270, or, c. 57. ed. Grab. Oxon. p. 357.

[3] Calicem, qui est ex ea creatura quæ est secundum nos, suum sanguinem confirmavit. ID. ib. c. 17. § 5. p. 249, or, ed. Grab. c. 32. p. 323.

[4] Eum panem in quo gratiæ actæ sint, corpus esse Domini. ID. lib. iv. c. 18. § 4. p. 251, or, ed. Grab. c. 34. p. 326.

[5] Dominus corpus suum panem vocat.... sanguinem suum vinum appellat. CYPR. Epist. ad Magn. 69. Op. ed. Oxon. 1682. Pt. 2. p. 182.

[6] Vinum fuisse quod sanguinem suum dixit. ID. Ep. ad Cæcil. 63. ib. p. 152.

[7] Calix Domini non est aqua sola, aut vinum solum, nisi utrumque sibi misceatur; quomodo nec Corpus Domini potest esse farina sola, aut aqua sola, nisi utrumque adunatum fuerit et copulatum, et panis unius compage solidatum. ID. ib. p. 154.

[8] Ne per saporem vini redoleat sanguinem Christi. ID. ib. p. 155.

Thus Augustine :—"We call by the name of the Body and "Blood of Christ that only which, being taken from the fruits "of the earth and consecrated by the sacramental prayer, we "rightly receive to our spiritual health, in memory of the "Lord's passion for us." [1] And he clearly tells us, that our Lord called the bread his body, when he says in a passage already quoted,[2] that "our Lord hesitated not to say, This is *my body*, when he was giving *the sign of his body*."

Thus Theodoret :—"In the delivery of the mysteries, he [*i. e.* our Lord] called the bread his body, and the mixture his blood." [3]

And again,—"As we call *the fruit of the vine* used in the sacrament, after consecration, *the blood of the Lord*, so he called the blood of the true vine the blood of the grape." [4]

And Chrysostom, speaking of the Holy Communion, says,—"For what is *the bread?* It is the Body of Christ." [5]

And Jerome says, that "the *bread* which the Lord broke and gave to his disciples was the body of the Lord the Saviour." [6]

So Paula in her letter to Marcella, inserted in the works of Jerome, says,—

"Melchizedek offered bread and wine for a type of Christ, and consecrated the Christian mystery in the Body and Blood of the Saviour;" [7] *i. e.* in the bread and wine which represented that Body and Blood, which she therefore calls the Body and Blood.

[1] Corpus Christi et sanguinem dicimus.... illud tantum quod ex fructibus terræ acceptum et prece mystica consecratum rite sumimus ad salutem spiritalem in memoriam pro nobis Dominicæ passionis. AUGUST. De Trin. lib. iii. c. 4. Op. viii. 565.

[2] See p. 70, above.

[3] Ἐν δέ γε τῇ τῶν μυστηρίων παραδόσει, σῶμα τὸν ἄρτον ἐκάλεσε, καὶ αἷμα τὸ κρᾶμα. THEODORET. Dial. 1. Immut. Op. ed. Schulz. 1769 et seq. tom. iv. p. 26.

[4] "Ωσπερ γὰρ ἡμεῖς τὸν μυστικὸν τῆς ἀμπέλου καρπὸν μετὰ τὸν ἁγιασμὸν αἷμα δεσποτικὸν ὀνομάζομεν· οὕτω τῆς ἀληθινῆς ἀμπέλου τὸ αἷμα σταφυλὴν ὠνόμασεν αἷμα. ID. ib. p. 25. See also a similar passage in his Quæst. in Gen. q. 110. Op. i. 115.

[5] Τί γάρ ἐστιν ὁ ἄρτος; σῶμα Χριστοῦ. CHRYS. In 1 Cor. hom. 24. 2. Op. ed. cit. x. 213.

[6] Nos audiamus panem quem fregit Dominus deditque discipulis suis esse corpus Domini Salvatoris; ipso dicente ad eos, *Accipite et comedite*, &c. HIERON. Ep. ad Hedib. ep. 120. Op. ed. Vallars. Ven. tom. i. col. 824.

[7] Melchisedech.... in typo Christi panem et vinum obtulit; et mysterium Christianum in Salvatoris sanguine et corpore dedicavit. PAULÆ et EUSTOCH. Epist. ad Marcellam. Apud Epist. Hieron. ep. 46. Op. ed. cit. i. 200.

And, in very similar language, Isidore of Seville says,—

"Christ also is a priest for ever, to whom it is said, 'Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedeck.' Namely, on account of the mystery of the sacrament which he commanded Christians to celebrate, directing us to offer as a sacrifice not cattle as victims according to Aaron, but an oblation of bread and wine, that is, the sacrament of his body and blood." [1]

So in the Harmony of the Gospels attributed to Tatian, and by others to Ammonius of Alexandria, we read that,—

"Christ having taken the bread and then the cup of wine, testified that they were his body and blood, and commanded them to eat and drink, as it was the memorial of his coming affliction and death." [2]

And Maxentius, after saying that the Church is called Christ's body, adds,—

"And that *bread* which the whole Church partakes of in memory of the Lord's passion is his body." [3]

And so Gaudentius says,—

"By the form of wine his blood is rightly signified, inasmuch as when he himself in the Gospel says, 'I am the true vine,' he sufficiently declares that all *the wine* which is offered for a figure of his passion is *his blood*." [4]

[1] Ipse quoque sacerdos æternus, ad quem dicitur: 'Tu es sacerdos in æternum secundum ordinem Melchisedeck.' Utique propter mysterium sacramenti, quod Christianis celebrare præcepit, ut non secundum Aaron pecudum victimas, sed oblationem panis et vini, id est, corporis et sanguinis ejus sacramentum, in sacrificium offeramus. Isidor. Hispal. Quæst. in Vet. Test. c. xi. Op. ed. Areval. tom. v. col. 298.

[2] Accepto pane, deinde vini calice, corpus esse suum ac sanguinem testatus, manducare illos jussit, et bibere, quod ea sit futuræ calamitatis suæ mortisque memoria. Tatiani Harmon. Evangel. in Bibl. Patr. ed. M. de la Bigne, Paris. 1624, tom. vii. col. 86. In the running title of the "Bibliotheca," it is attributed to Ammonius of Alexandria, but in a notice of the work the Editor ascribes it to Tatian the Syrian. The "Harmonia Evangelica" that precedes it, and is ascribed in the running title to Tatian, is generally considered to be that of Ammonius of Alexandria, and is given as such by Gallandi in his edition of the Bibliotheca Patrum, vol. 2.

[3] Sed est panis ille quem universa Ecclesia in memoriam Dominicæ passionis participat corpus ejus. Maxentii Adv. Nestor. Dialog. ii. c. 13. Inter Scripta Vet. Lat. ed. Simlero. Tigur. 1571, fol. 62.

[4] Recte etiam vini specie sanguis ejus exprimitur, quia cum ipse in Evangelio dicit, "Ego sum vitis vera," satis declarat sanguinem suum esse omne vinum quod in figura Passionis ejus offertur. Gaudentii Brix. De Exod. tract. vel serm. 2. Op. ed. Galeard. Brix. 1738. p. 240.

And in the Ethiopic Church, when they celebrate the Eucharist, they use the very words, "This *bread* is my body," and "This *cup* is my blood;"[1] and as Ludolf reports on good authority, though they speak of a change in the bread and wine, they believe no other change but "a change from common to sacred, so as to *represent* the true body and blood of Christ to the communicants."[2]

And one of the Canons of a Council at Carthage in the year 418 or 419, as received in the Greek Church, runs thus:—

"That in the sacred rites nothing must be offered but *the Body and Blood of the Lord*, as also the Lord himself directed; *that is, bread and wine mingled with water*."[3]

Now this is quite inconsistent with the doctrine either of Transubstantiation or Consubstantiation. For according to neither of these is the bread the body, and the wine the blood of Christ; but, in the case of the former, the bread and wine are supposed to disappear, and the body and blood of Christ to be substituted for them; and in the case of the latter, the body and blood of Christ are merely joined to the bread and wine. In fact, as we have already seen,[4] Bellarmine himself admits, that if our Lord is to be understood as saying, "This *bread* is my body," he must be considered as having spoken figuratively. And the Tridentine Catechism admits, that according to their sense of the words "This is my body," "if the substance of bread remained, it would seem that it could not be in any way said, This is my Body."[5]

(3.) *They say also, that our Lord's Body, as it exists in the Eucharist, is* MADE OF BREAD, *and his Blood* OF WINE; *which can only refer to a representative presence of his Body and Blood by the bread and wine.*

[1] Hic panis est corpus meum.—Hic calix est meus sanguis. LUDOLFI Hist. Æthiop. lib. iii. c. 5. § 56. Francof. 1681. fol.

[2] E profano in sacrum mutari, ut verum corpus et sanguinem Christi communicantibus repræsentet. ID. ib. § 55.

[3] Ἵνα ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις μηδὲν πλέον τοῦ σώματος καὶ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ Κυρίου προσενεχθείη, ὡς καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ Κύριος παρέδωκε· τουτέστιν, ἄρτου καὶ οἴνου ὕδατι μεμιγμένου. SYNOD. CARTHAG. ut recept. in Eccles. Græc.; Canon 44. See Πηδάλιον τῆς τῶν ὀρθοδόξων Ἐκκλησίας. Athens, 1841. 4to. p. 285.

[4] See p. 71 above.

[5] Si panis substantia remaneret, nullo modo dici videretur, Hoc est corpus meum. CATECH. TRIDENT. pt. 2. c. 4. q. 31.

Thus Tertullian, in a passage already quoted,[1] says, "He made bread his body, by saying, This is my body, that is, a figure of my body."

Thus also Gaudentius says,—

"Therefore the Creator and Lord of natures himself, who produces bread out of the earth, out of bread again (inasmuch as he is able, and has promised) makes his own body; and he who made wine out of water, makes also out of wine his own blood." [2]

So also Jerome, expounding the words, "for wheat, and wine, and oil," in Jer. xxxi. 12, says,—

"Of which *the bread of the Lord* is made, and the type of his blood is perfected, and the blessing of sanctification is represented." [3]

(4.) *They give us reasons why the bread in the Eucharist is called Christ's Body and the wine his Blood, showing that they did not consider them to be so really, but only representatively.*

Thus Augustine, in the following well-known but remarkable passage:—

"If sacraments had not a certain similitude to those things of which they are sacraments, they would not be sacraments at all. But from this *similitude*, they for the most part *receive the names even of the things themselves*. As, therefore, after a certain manner the sacrament of the Body of Christ is the Body of Christ, the sacrament of the Blood of Christ is the Blood of Christ, so the sacrament of faith is faith. But to believe is nothing else than to have faith. And on this account, when the answer is given that a little child believes, who has not yet the feeling of faith, he is said to have faith on account of the sacrament of faith, and to turn himself to God on account of the sacrament of conversion, because the answer itself belongs to the celebration of the sacrament. As, speaking of baptism itself, the Apostle says, 'We are buried with Christ by baptism into death.' He does not say, We signify burial; but he says outright, 'We are buried.' Therefore, *the sacrament of so*

[1] See p. 62 above.

[2] Ipse igitur naturarum Creator et Dominus, qui producit de terra panem, de pane rursus (quia et potest, et promisit) efficit proprium corpus; et qui de aqua vinum fecit, facit et de vino sanguinem suum. GAUDENT. BRIX. De Exod. tract. vel serm. 2. Op. ed. Galeard. Brix. 1738. fol. p. 240.

[3] "Super frumento," inquit, "et vino et oleo;" de quo conficitur panis Domini, et sanguinis ejus impletur typus, et benedictio sanctificationis ostenditur. HIERON. Comment. in Jerem. xxxi. 12. Op. iv. 1063.

*great a thing, he called by no other name than that of the thing itself.* Therefore although not yet that faith which has its footing in the will of those who believe, yet nevertheless the sacrament of that very faith makes the little child one of the faithful. For as it is said to believe, so also it is called faithful, not by assenting to the thing with the very mind, but by receiving the sacrament of that very thing." [1]

So also Primasius, commenting on St. Paul's notice of the Eucharist in 1 Cor. xi., says,—

"God our Saviour gave us an example, that as often as we do this, we should have in mind that Christ died for us all. *Therefore it is called by us the Body of Christ*, that when we shall remember this, we may not be ungrateful for his grace." [2]

So, also, Isidore of Seville, after having spoken of the custom of receiving the Eucharist fasting, "that in honor of so great a "sacrament *the body of the Lord* should enter the mouth of a "Christian before other meats," [3] says,—

"*Bread*, inasmuch as it strengthens the body, is therefore *called the Body of Christ;* but *wine*, inasmuch as it produces blood in the flesh, is therefore referred to *the Blood of Christ*." [4]

[1] Si enim sacramenta quamdam similitudinem earum rerum quarum sacramenta sunt non haberent, omnino sacramenta non essent. Ex hac autem similitudine plerumque etiam ipsarum rerum nomina accipiunt. Sicut ergo secundum quemdam modum sacramentum corporis Christi corpus Christi est, sacramentum sanguinis Christi sanguis Christi est, ita sacramentum fidei fides est. Nihil est autem aliud credere, quam fidem habere. Ac per hoc cum respondetur parvulus credere, qui fidei nondum habet affectum, respondetur fidem habere propter fidei sacramentum, et convertere se ad Deum propter conversionis sacramentum, quia et ipsa responsio ad celebrationem pertinet sacramenti. Sicut de ipso baptismo Apostolus, "Consepulti," inquit, "sumus Christo per baptismum in mortem." Non ait sepulturam significavimus : sed prorsus ait, "Consepulti sumus." Sacramentum ergo tantæ rei nonnisi ejusdem rei vocabulo nuncupavit. Itaque parvulum, etsi nondum fides illa, quæ in credentium voluntate consistit, jam tamen ipsius fidei sacramentum fidelem facit. Nam sicut credere respondetur, ita etiam fidelis vocatur, non rem ipsa mente annuendo, sed ipsius rei sacramentum percipiendo. Id. Ep. ad Bonifac. Episc. ep. 98. Op. ii. 202, 203.

[2] Salvator Deus exemplum dedit, ut quotiescunque hoc facimus, in mente habeamus quod Christus pro nobis omnibus mortuus est. Ideo nobis dicitur, Corpus Christi, ut cum hoc recordati fuerimus, non simus ingrati gratiæ ejus. Primasius, Comment. in Ep. 1. ad Corinth. c. xi.—Biblioth. Patr. ed. Migne, tom. 68. col. 534.

[3] In os Christiani prius Dominicum corpus intraret quam cæteri cibi.

[4] Panis, quia corpus confirmat, ideo Corpus Christi nuncupatur: vinum autem, quia sanguinem operatur in carne, ideo ad sanguinem Christi refertur. Isidor. Hispal. De eccles. offic. lib. i. c. 18. Op. ed. Areval. tom. vi. col. 383.

This passage, with its context, very clearly shows what the antients meant, when they spoke of eating and receiving into the mouth *the Lord's Body*.

But the testimony of Facundus, bishop of Hermiana (fl. a. 540) is most express and decisive. Thus he writes :—

"If the antient doctors of the Church could be shown to have said, that Christ received the adoption of sons, neither they, nor the whole Church that had such doctors ought to be judged heretical. For Christ vouchsafed to receive the Sacrament of adoption, both when he was circumcised and when he was baptised; and *the sacrament of adoption may be called adoption; as we call the sacrament of his body and blood, which is in the consecrated bread and cup, his body and blood;* NOT THAT THE BREAD IS PROPERLY HIS BODY AND THE CUP HIS BLOOD; but because they contain in themselves the mystery of his body and blood. Hence also the Lord himself *called* the bread and cup he had blessed, which he gave to his disciples, his body and blood. Wherefore, as the faithful servants of Christ, receiving the sacrament of his body and blood, are rightly said to receive the body and blood of Christ; so also Christ himself, when he had received *the sacrament of the adoption of sons*, might rightly be said to have received *the adoption of sons*."[1]

To see the full force of this passage, we must observe the argument involved in it.

(5.) *That which the Fathers call the Body and Blood of Christ in the Eucharist, they speak of in terms not applicable to our Lord's real Body and Blood, but only applicable to the material elements.*

Thus Origen says,—

"Ye who are accustomed to be present at the Divine mysteries

[1] Adoptionem quoque filiorum suscepisse Christum, si antiqui doctores Ecclesiæ dixisse monstrarentur, nec ipsi nec omnis Ecclesia quæ tales doctores habuit, judicari deberet hæretica. Nam sacramentum adoptionis suscipere dignatus est Christus, et quando circumcisus est, et quando baptizatus est; et potest sacramentum adoptionis adoptio nuncupari: sicut sacramentum corporis et sanguinis ejus, quod est in pane et poculo consecrato, corpus ejus et sanguinem dicimus; non quod proprie corpus ejus sit panis, et poculum sanguis; sed quod in se mysterium corporis ejus sanguinisque contineant. Hinc et ipse Dominus benedictum panem et calicem quem discipulis tradidit, corpus et sanguinem suum vocavit. Quocirca sicut Christi fideles sacramentum corporis et sanguinis ejus accipientes, corpus et sanguinem Christi recte dicuntur accipere, sic et ipse Christus, sacramentum adoptionis filiorum cum suscepisset, potuit recte dici adoptionem filiorum suscepisse. FACUNDI HERMIANENS. Pro defens. trium capit. lib. ix. c. 5. —Biblioth. Patr. Lat. ed. Migne, tom. lxvii. col. 762, 3.

know, how, when ye take *the Lord's Body*, ye take care of it with all caution and veneration, lest *any little portion of it should fall down*, lest any part of the consecrated gift should slip away." [1]

This language can only refer to the material bread, the representative of our Lord's Body.

And so Chrysostom says, that, in a tumult at Constantinople,—

"The most sacred blood of Christ was spilt upon the garments of the soldiers." [2]

Thus also Augustine speaks of our "taking a part of the body of the immaculate lamb." [3]

And Ambrose, speaking of "*the blood of Christ*," says, "If "you take little, or drink a large draught, there is the same "perfect measure of redemption to all." [4]

So in a decree attributed in the Canon Law to Pope Pius I., it is said that, "if through negligence any portion of the blood "of Christ shall have dropped upon the earth, it must be licked "up with the tongue." [5]

And in a work attributed to Prosper, we read of a person receiving "a small particle of the Lord's Body." [6]

Now it is obvious that our Lord's Body and Blood, present (as alleged) in a spiritual form, cannot be thus broken or parted into portions, or fall to the earth. These phrases are applicable only to things material, and must therefore refer only to the elements as the representative Body and Blood.

[1] Nostis qui divinis mysteriis interesse consuestis, quomodo cum suscipitis corpus Domini, cum omni cautela et veneratione servatis, ne ex eo parum quid decidat, ne consecrati muneris aliquid dilabatur. ORIGEN. In Exod. hom. xiii. § 3. Op. ii. 176.

[2] Τὸ ἁγιώτατον αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὡς ἐν τοσούτῳ θορύβῳ, εἰς τὰ τῶν προειρημένων στρατιωτῶν ἱμάτια ἐξεχεῖτο. CHRYSOST. Epist. 1a. ad Innocent. § 3. Op. iii. 519.

[3] De agni immaculati corpore partem sumere. AUGUST. Epist. ad Casulan. ep. 36. § 24. Op. ii. 59.

[4] Et si parum sumas, et si plurimum haurias, eadem perfecta est omnibus mensura redemptionis. AMBROS. Epist. ad Justum. Ep. vii. § 8. Op. ii. Pt. 1. col. 779.

[5] Si per negligentiam aliquid de sanguine Domini stillaverit in terram, lingua lambetur. GRATIANI Decret. P. 3. De Consecr. dist. 2. c. 27.—Corp. Jur. Canon. Lugd. 1624. tom. i. col. 1924.

[6] Brevem particulam corporis Domini. PSEUDO-PROSPER. Liber de promiss. et predict. Dei. Par. 4. (*vocat.* Dimidium temporis) c. 6. Op. Paris. 1711. Appendix.

True, the Romanists and their followers use these phrases, but they do so most improperly and absurdly; for if, as they maintain, the Body and Blood of Christ are present only in a spiritual form, (not daring to affirm their material presence) it is irrational to talk of their being broken into portions and falling to the earth, and suffering such-like incidents.

Of a similar kind is the following passage in a letter of Jerome to Theophilus of Alexandria, where, speaking of a work of his which he had translated, he says,—

"We admired in your work the profit to be gained from it by all the Churches, that they who are ignorant, instructed by the testimonies of the Scriptures, may learn with what reverence they ought to handle holy things, and minister at Christ's altar; and that the sacred chalices and holy coverings and the other things which pertain to the service of the Lord's Passion are not without sanctity, as if they were merely things without life and destitute of sense; but, from their accompanying the Body and Blood of the Lord, are to be venerated *with the same reverence as his Body and Blood.*"[1]

If Jerome had been speaking of a real presence of our Lord's Body and Blood, it is impossible that he could have directed the chalices and coverings to be treated with the *same reverence.* But of the representative Body and Blood he might thus speak.

(6.) *The consecrated sacramental substances were used in the Antient Church in a way which is utterly irreconcileable with the notion of their being, or having conjoined to them, the real Body and Blood of Christ.*

Thus the Author of the Commentary on the Epistles of St. Paul, attributed to Jerome, tells us, that "those who came "together in the Church offered their oblations separately, "and, after the communion, whatever remained to them of the

[1] Mirati sumus in opere tuo utilitatem omnium Ecclesiarum, ut discant qui ignorant, eruditi testimoniis Scripturarum, qua debeant veneratione sancta suscipere, et altaris Christi ministerio deservire; sacrosque calices, et sancta velamina, et cætera, quæ ad cultum Dominicæ pertinent Passionis, non quasi inania et sensu carentia sanctimoniam non habere; sed ex consortio Corporis et Sanguinis Domini eadem qua Corpus ejus et Sanguis majestate veneranda. HIERON. Epist. ad Theophil. ep. 114. Op. i. 759.

"sacrifices [which would then be *the consecrated sacramental* "*substances*], they consumed alike, eating their supper in com- "mon in the Church."[1]

That is, the remains of the consecrated sacramental substances were used for the purpose of a common meal; which certainly could not have been done, if they had regarded them as being, or having conjoined to them, the real Body and Blood of Christ.

And Isychius of Jerusalem says, that it was the custom in the Church in his time to "put into the fire whatever remained unconsumed" of the consecrated things in the Eucharist.[2] This might indicate their desire to preserve what had been consecrated from being used for any common purpose, but is certainly inconsistent with the notion of their considering it as having in it, or annexed to it, the Body and Blood of Christ.

And Basil, speaking of the importance of being frequently a partaker of "the holy body and blood of Christ," tells us, that in Alexandria and Egypt, the laity kept "the communion," given them by the priest, in their own houses, and partook of it when they pleased; and that taking a part of it was equivalent to receiving the communion at the hands of the priest; for that, in the Church, the communicant put it into his mouth with his own hands; and that "it is the same in efficacy, whether any one receives from the priest one piece, or several pieces together."[3]

[1] In Ecclesia convenientes, oblationes suas separatim offerebant: et post communionem quæcumque eis de sacrificiis superfuissent, illi in Ecclesia communem cœnam comedentes pariter consumebant. PSEUDO-HIERON. Comment in 1 Cor. c. xi. Inter Hieron. Op. tom. xi. These Commentaries are attributed by some to Pelagius, but that does not affect the truth of the *fact* stated in the above extract.

[2] Sed hoc quod reliquum est de carnibus et panibus in igne incendi præcepit. Quod nunc videmus etiam sensibiliter in Ecclesia fieri, ignique tradi quæcumque remanere contigerit inconsumpta. ISYCH. Comment. in Levit. lib. 2. Ed. Basil. 1527. fol. in fol. 49. D.

[3] Ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ δὲ καὶ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ ἕκαστος καὶ τῶν ἐν λαῷ τελούντων, ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πλεῖστον, ἔχει κοινωνίαν ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ὅτε βούλεται, μεταλαμβάνει δι' ἑαυτοῦ. Ἅπαξ γὰρ τὴν θυσίαν τοῦ ἱερέως τελειώσαντος καὶ δεδωκότος, ὁ λαβὼν αὐτὴν ὡς ὅλην ὁμοῦ, καθ' ἑκάστην μεταλαμβάνων, παρὰ τοῦ δεδωκότος εἰκότως μεταλαμβάνειν καὶ ὑποδέχεσθαι πιστεύειν ὀφείλει. Καὶ γὰρ καὶ ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ὁ ἱερεὺς ἐπιδίδωσι τὴν μερίδα, καὶ κατέχει αὐτὴν ὁ ὑποδεχόμενος μετ' ἐξουσίας ἁπάσης, καὶ οὕτω προσάγει τῷ στόματι τῇ ἰδίᾳ χειρί. Ταὐτὸν τοίνυν ἐστὶ τῇ δυνάμει, εἴτε μίαν μερίδα δέξεταί τις παρὰ τοῦ ἱερέως, εἴτε πολλὰς μερίδας ὁμοῦ. BASIL. CÆSAR. Epist. ad Cæsariam. ep. 93. Op. ed. cit. tom. iii. p. 187.

Will our authors then contend, that in every piece they occasionally broke off from the portion given them by the priest, there was in or under it, or annexed to it, the real and entire body of our Blessed Lord? If so, I can only conclude, as I think we may do in various parts of this argument between us, in the old form,—"Quod est absurdum. *Ergo*, &c."

(7.) *Hence the Fathers themselves tell us, that it is customary to call* THE SIGNS *in the Eucharist, as in other cases, by the names of* THE THINGS SIGNIFIED *by them, the consecrated bread and wine being styled the Body and Blood of Christ as figuratively representing them.*

This appears from the passages just quoted, especially that from St. Augustine, where he tells us, that, "from the *similitude*, the sacraments receive *the names of the things themselves*," quoting an Apostle as calling a sacrament by the title of the thing itself.[1]

But I will add a few more.

Thus Augustine says, — "Almost all call the sacrament Christ's Body."[2]

And elsewhere he says generally,—"All things that re-"present other things, appear in a certain manner to sustain "the characters of those things which they represent: as it is "said by the Apostle, 'The rock *was* Christ;' since the rock "of which this was spoken *represented* Christ."[3]

And again,—

"A thing which is a sign is accustomed to be *called by the name of the thing which it signifies;* as it is written, 'The seven ears are seven years' (Gen. 41. 26); for he did not say, they 'signify seven years;' and 'the seven kine are seven years,' and many others of the kind. Hence is that which is said, 'The rock was Christ.' For he did not say, 'The rock *signified* Christ,' but as it were *was* this very thing, though indeed it was not this in substance but in *signification*. So also the blood, because on account of a certain

[1] See p. 241 above.

[2] Pene quidem sacramentum omnes corpus ejus dicunt. AUGUST. Serm. 354. Op. tom. v. col. 959.

[3] Omnia significantia videntur quodam modo earum rerum, quas significant, sustinere personas: sicut dictum est ab Apostolo, "Petra erat Christus;" quoniam petra illa, de qua hoc dictum est, significabat utique Christum. ID. De Civ. Dei. lib. xviii. c. 48. Op. vii. 402.

vital substantiality it *signifies* the life, is in sacraments *called the life*." [1]

And he tells us elsewhere, that this is the peculiar characteristic of a sacrament, *that one thing should be called by the name of another thing signified by it*. He says, commenting on what he considers to be sacramental language,—"*The "names are changed, that it might be shown to be a sacra-"ment;* lest, if the same name had been given in the title of "the Psalm, he might appear, not to have spoken something "prophetically to us in a sacrament, but as it were to have "related what was really done;" [2] and he tells us, that "the names are changed, in order that the change of names might rouse our attention to the meaning of the mystery." [3]

And so Theodoret:—

"To the body he gave the name of the symbol, and to the symbol the name of the body. Thus, having called himself a vine, he styled the symbol blood." [4]

And again,—

For having styled his natural body food and bread, and moreover having called himself a vine, he honored *the visible symbols with the appellation of his body and blood;* not having changed their nature, but having added grace to nature." [5]

[1] Solet autem res quæ significat, ejus rei nomine quam significat nuncupari, sicut scriptum est, Septem spicæ septem anni sunt: non enim dixit, septem annos significant: et, Septem boves septem anni sunt: et multa hujusmodi. Hinc est quod dictum est, Petra erat Christus. Non enim dixit, Petra significat Christum, sed tamquam hoc esset, quod utique per substantiam non hoc erat, sed per significationem. Sic et sanguis quoniam propter vitalem quamdam corpulentiam animam significat, in sacramentis anima dictus est. AUGUST. Quæst. in Levit. lib. iii. q. 57. Op. iii. pt. 1. c. 385.

[2] Diximus autem nomina mutata esse, ut sacramentum ostenderetur: ne si idem nomen repetitum esset in titulo Psalmi, non nobis prophetasse aliquid in sacramento, sed quasi gesta narrasse videretur. ID. In Psalm. xxxiii. Serm. 2. § 2. Op. iv. 161.

[3] Ideo enim mutata sunt nomina, ut ad mysterii significationem nos excitaret mutatio nominum. ID. ib. serm 1. § 7. ib. 159.

[4] Τῷ μὲν σώματι τὸ τοῦ συμβόλου τέθεικεν ὄνομα· τῷ δὲ συμβόλῳ τὸ τοῦ σώματος. οὕτως ἄμπελον ἑαυτὸν ὀνομάσας, αἷμα τὸ σύμβολον προσηγόρευσεν. THEODORET. Dial. 1. Immut. Op. ed. cit. iv. 25.

[5] Ὁ γὰρ δὴ τὸ φύσει σῶμα σῖτον καὶ ἄρτον προσαγορεύσας, καὶ αὖ πάλιν ἑαυτὸν ἄμπελον ὀνομάσας, οὗτος τὰ ὁρώμενα σύμβολα τῇ τοῦ σώματος καὶ αἵματος προσηγορίᾳ τετίμηκεν, οὐ τὴν φύσιν μεταβαλὼν, ἀλλὰ τὴν χάριν τῇ φύσει προστεθεικώς. ID. ib.

Hence we see at once, that all those passages which the advocates of a real objective presence of Christ's Body and Blood put forward as their very best and strongest testimonies, have no force at all.

For instance, St. Jerome is quoted as speaking of the priests making Christ's Body. "Upon whose prayers," he says, "Christ's Body and Blood is made."[1] And he speaks of them as those "who make the Body of Christ with their sacred mouth."[2]

But when we compare such language with the explanation given by the Fathers themselves of the sense in which they use the phrase *the Body and Blood of Christ*, it affords not the slightest countenance to the doctrine in question.

The long list of passages, therefore, collected by Dr. Pusey on this point[3] is absolutely of no value. It literally proves nothing. No one doubts that the Fathers freely called the consecrated elements in the Lord's Supper the Body and Blood of Christ; and spoke of their reception as bringing, to the faithful, communion with the Body and Blood of Christ, and all the blessings attendant upon such communion. They seem indeed carefully to have used this phrase in speaking of the sacred elements, for the purpose of raising the minds of their hearers or readers from the visible symbols lying before them to those things which they represented. And in the absence of such doctrines as have afflicted the Church at a later period, we may easily understand how such language was considered not only harmless, but as having a useful tendency.

As Bishop Cosin (a favorite Tractarian referee) says,—

"That was the antient Fathers' care, as it is ours still, to instruct the people not to look barely on the outward elements, but in them to eye with their minds the body and blood of Christ, and with their hearts lift [lifted] up to feed on that heavenly meat; for all the benefit of a sacrament is lost, if we look no farther than the elements. Hence it is that those holy men, the better to teach this lesson to their hearers, and move their hearts more efficaciously, *spake of the signs as if they had been the thing signified*, and, like

[1] Ad quorum preces Christi corpus sanguisque conficitur. HIERON. Ep. ad Evagr.

[2] Qui Christi corpus sacro ore conficiunt. ID. Ep. ad Heliod.

[3] See the work by Dr. Pusey, mentioned p. 231 above, in the last note of the volume.

orators, said many things which will not bear a literal sense, nor a strict examen." [1]

And, commenting on a passage of Chrysostom on this subject, he remarks that his observation "is no more than this, that "*sensible* things are *called by the name* of those spiritual things "which they *seal* and *signify*." [2]

(8.) *The* SACRAMENTUM *and the* RES SACRAMENTI *do not, according to the Fathers, form one compound whole*[3] *in the consecrated substances, and the latter is not necessarily received by all who receive the consecrated substances.*

The proposition here negatived lies at the foundation of the systems of the Archdeacons. But the very proposition itself, if we understand the word *sacrament* in the sense given to it by the Archdeacons, involves a self-contradiction. For when the word *sacramentum* is used with reference to the sacramental substances, it signifies *the consecrated* sacramental substances. And our authors strenuously maintain, that the consecrated sacramental substances, or sacrament, consist of the sign and the thing signified together. They cannot, therefore, consistently argue that the consecrated sacramental substances consist of the sacrament and the thing signified by the sign; for they are thus using the word *sacrament* in two different senses when applying it to the selfsame thing. If the *sacrament* received into the mouth, consists of the *sign* and the *thing signified*, it is absolute self-contradiction to say elsewhere, that what is received into the mouth consists of the *sacrament* and the *thing signified*; the word *sacrament* being thus used with reference to the same thing in two entirely different senses.

Hence it is impossible for them consistently to use the distinction between the *sacramentum* and the *res sacramenti* when speaking of the elements, because with them the *sacramentum* includes and involves the *res*. But here is their difficulty.

[1] COSIN, Hist. of Transubstantiation (Engl. transl.) c. vi. § 8. ed. 1840. p. 148.

[2] Id. ib. c. v. § 18. p 99.

[3] It will be remembered that the words of Archdeacon Wilberforce are, that "The *sacramentum* and *res sacramenti* are united by the act of consecration into a compound whole. The two, therefore, are so united that they must needs go together; and whoso receives the one receives the other." (p. 120. 3rd ed. p. 102.)

They find this done by the Fathers; and therefore they are compelled to use the phraseology: but they avoid the inference to be deduced from it, by a slippery and double use of the word *sacramentum*.

Now, that the sign and the thing signified do *not* form one compound whole, and that the latter is not necessarily received by all who receive the consecrated elements, is as clearly and definitely affirmed by Augustine, not to mention other Fathers, as words can express it.

Thus, he tells us, that "the sacrament of the Body and Blood "of Christ is taken by some to life, by some to destruction; "but the thing itself of which it is a sacrament is to every man "for life, to none for destruction, whosoever may be partaker "of it."[1]

The *sacramentum*, therefore, may be partaken of without the *res*.

As I have already observed,[2] the only reply which Archdeacon Wilberforce has to make to this passage is, that "Here he pro- "bably uses *res sacramenti* for *virtus sacramenti*, for that his "belief was, that the inward part or Body of Christ is received by "all communicants, is obvious from other passages."[3] That is, he shuts his eyes to the fact, that Augustine himself tells us, that the signs are called by the names of the things signified, and *will* maintain, against Augustine's own express testimony (as I shall show more fully hereafter), that because he speaks of the wicked receiving the Body and Blood of Christ, he held that they received them, not merely *sacramentally* (which all admit) but really, and in truth; and on the strength of this palpable misrepresentation of Augustine's views, he alters his words from "res sacramenti" to "virtus sacramenti."

But I see not how, according to his own showing, he would gain anything even by this change. For he himself confesses elsewhere, that "St. Augustine does not distinguish between the *res sacramenti* and the *virtus sacramenti*," and complains of him

[1] Hujus rei sacramentum, id est, unitatis corporis et sanguinis Christi alicubi quotidie, alicubi certis intervallis dierum in Dominica mensa præparatur, et de mensa Dominica sumitur; quibusdam ad vitam, quibusdam ad exitium: res vero ipsa cujus sacramentum est, omni homini ad vitam, nulli ad exitium, quicumque ejus particeps fuerit. AUGUST. In Johann. tract. 26. 15. Op. tom. iii. Pt. 2. col. 362.

[2] See p. 189 above.

[3] p. 119; or 3rd ed. p. 101. See also pp. 224, 5; or, 191, 2.

for not doing so, because it quite destroys the Archdeacon's theory, that the two may be separated, and the first mean "the inward part or thing signified," to be received by everybody, and the second, "its effect on the devout soul."[1]

But he is quite right in saying, that Augustine did *not* distinguish between these two, and on the strength of this admission I will give him some passages from Augustine showing his view on the point now under consideration.

"The sacrament," says Augustine, "is *one thing;* the virtue of the sacrament is *another*."[2] And he holds that the one may be received without the other; for he says,—"If you wish to "know that you have received the Spirit, ask thy heart; lest "perchance you have the sacrament, and *have not* the virtue of "the sacrament."[3]

And speaking of the sacraments of the Old Testament he says,—

"Though the sacraments were all common, the grace which is the virtue of sacraments was not common to all. As also now, when the faith is revealed, which was then concealed, the laver of regeneration is common to all that are baptized in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit; but the grace itself of which they[4] are the sacraments, by which [grace] the members of Christ are regenerated with their Head, is not common to all."[5]

But again Augustine says,—

"He who does not dwell in Christ, and in whom Christ does not dwell, beyond doubt neither eats [spiritually] his flesh, nor drinks his blood, [although he carnally and visibly may press with his teeth

[1] p. 224. 3rd ed. p. 191.

[2] Aliud est sacramentum, aliud virtus sacramenti. Aug. (ut supr.) § 11. col. 360.

[3] Ergo si vis nosse quia accepisti Spiritum, interroga cor tuum; ne forte sacramentum habes, et virtutem sacramenti non habes. Id. In Epist. prim. Joh. tract. vi. § 10. Op. vii. 633.

[4] From the plural being here used, it would seem that something has been *left out*. The passage as written by Augustine evidently included the other sacrament. However, as it stands, it is sufficient for our purpose.

[5] Cum essent omnia communia sacramenta, non communis erat omnibus gratia, quæ sacramentorum virtus est. Sicut et nunc jam revelata fide, quæ tunc velabatur, omnibus in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti baptizatis commune est lavacrum regenerationis; sed ipsa gratia cujus ipsa sunt sacramenta, qua membra corporis Christi cum suo capite regenerata sunt, non communis est omnibus. Id. Enarr. in Psalm. lxxvii. § 2. Op. iv. 610.

the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ], but rather eats and drinks the sacrament of so great a thing to his condemnation."[1]

Here it is clear, that Augustine holds, that some receive the *sacrament* of the Body and Blood of Christ who do not receive that Body and Blood; and that the word *sacrament* is used, as Archdeacon Wilberforce admits[2] that it is used by Augustine, to signify "the outward sign."

So again he says elsewhere,—"He shows what it is, to eat "the body of Christ and drink his blood, not in the sacra- "ment merely, but *in reality*."[3]

And again, in the same treatise, he speaks of those who "not "in the sacrament only, but *in reality* have eaten the body of "Christ."[4]

Words cannot more distinctly show, that he held, that some who eat the body of Christ and drink his blood *sacramentally*, that is, the memorials of his body and blood in the sacrament, do not eat and drink them *in reality*, and therefore that the signs are *not* so conjoined to the things signified, that all who receive the one, must receive the other with them.

So in passages which I shall quote more fully presently, he says, that sacraments are "*visible signs* of divine things, but the invisible things themselves are honored in them;"[5] and that "in sacraments it is always considered, not what they are, but what they exhibit; since they are signs of things; *being one thing, and signifying another*."[6]

And elsewhere he says, that "the visible sacrifice is *a sacrament*, THAT IS, A SACRED SIGN, of the invisible sacrifice."[7]

And the invisible sacrifice, he tells us, is the contrite heart. Now the contrite heart may certainly be present with, and accompany the visible sacrifice, but it is not so conjoined to it

[1] For the original of this, see below in the section respecting the wicked not eating really the Body and Blood of Christ. The words within brackets are said to be omitted in many MSS.

[2] p. 119; or 3rd ed. p. 101.

[3] Ostendit quid sit, non sacramento tenus, sed re vera corpus Christi manducare et sanguinem ejus bibere. ID. De Civ. Dei, xxi. 25. Op. vii. 489.

[4] Non solo sacramento, sed re ipsa manducaverunt corpus Christi. ID. De Civ. Dei, xxi. 20. Op. vii. 483.

[5] See p. 256 below.

[6] See pp. 256, 257 below.

[7] Sacrificium ergo visibile invisibilis sacrificii sacramentum, id est, sacrum signum est. ID. De Civ. Dei, x. 5. Op. vii. 184.

as to form one compound whole with it, such that if the visible sacrifice was to be put into the mouth, the other would go into the mouth with it.

The word *sacramentum* or *sacrament*, therefore, *when applied to the consecrated sacramental substances*, means, according to the Fathers, a sign only.

If, indeed, the word is used with reference to *the rite as a whole*, then there is a sense in which it may be said, that it consists of two parts, the sign and the thing signified, because in the case of the faithful recipient these two are present and received by the communicant.

But as decisive a proof as any, that they did not hold the internal part of the sacrament to be conjoined to the visible form or matter, and so received at the hands of the priest, is in their testimony that the grace is given *direct from God.*

Thus Augustine, refuting the false notions of the Donatists as to the minister's part in Baptism, says,—

"It is always God's grace and God's sacrament; the ministry only is of man; who, if he is good, cleaves to God and works with God; but if he is evil, God works through him *the visible form* of the sacrament, but *he himself gives the invisible grace.*" [1]

And so of *sacraments generally*, he says, interpreting the words addressed to Moses, "Thou shalt sanctify him,"—

"How did Moses sanctify, and the Lord? For Moses did not sanctify for the Lord: but Moses by the visible sacraments through his ministry; but the Lord by his invisible grace through the Holy Spirit, *whence comes the whole fruit even of visible sacraments. For without that sanctification of invisible grace, of what use are the visible sacraments?*" [2]

These words clearly involve the doctrine, that a sacrament may be received without the grace being received by which it

[1] Semper Dei est illa gratia et Dei sacramentum, hominis autem solum ministerium; qui si bonus est, adhæret Deo, et operatur cum Deo; si autem malus est, operatur per illum Deus visibilem sacramenti formam, ipse autem donat invisibilem gratiam. August. Epist. ad Donat. ep. 105. 12. Op. ii. 228.

[2] Quomodo ergo et Moyses sanctificat et Dominus? Non enim Moyses pro Domino: sed Moyses visibilibus sacramentis per ministerium suum; Dominus autem invisibili gratia per Spiritum Sanctum, ubi est totus fructus etiam visibilium sacramentorum. Nam sine ista sanctificatione invisibilis gratiæ, visibilia sacramenta quid prosunt? Id. Quæst. in Levit. lib. iii. q. 84. Op. iii. 1. 391.

was intended that it should be accompanied, and is accompanied in the case of worthy recipients; and Augustine proceeds to instance this in the case of Simon Magus.

And in like manner he says elsewhere, "God gives the sacra-"ment of grace by bad men; but the grace itself only by him-"self or his saints." [1]

(9.) *The Fathers say, that the sacraments of the New Testament (when using the word in the sense of the consecrated sacramental substances or entities) are signs.*

To this effect frequently speaks Augustine. Thus he says, that, "as, to keep to the letter and take the signs for the "things which are signified by them, is the part of servile in-"firmity, so, to give a meaning to the signs which makes them "useless, is the consequence of the wanderings of error." [2]

And in the previous part of the same work he thus defines what he means by a sign. He says,—"Discoursing on signs, "I make this remark, that no one must fix his attention in "them on what they are, but rather that they are signs, that "is, that they signify something. For a sign is a thing, which, "besides the form which it presents to the senses, causes some-"thing else *external to itself* to come *into the mind.*" [3]

And he remarks, that "it is a miserable slavery of the mind "to take signs for the things signified, and not to be able to "lift the eye of the mind above the corporeal creature to im-"bibe the eternal light." [4]

Again, he says that "signs," "when they appertain to divine things, are called sacraments." [5]

[1] Sacramentum gratiæ dat Deus etiam per malos; ipsam vero gratiam non nisi per se ipsum vel sanctos suos. Id. De bapt. contr. Don. v. 21. Op. ix. 105.

[2] Ut autem literam sequi, et signa pro rebus quæ iis significantur accipere, servilis infirmitatis est, ita inutiliter signa interpretari male vagantis erroris est. August. De doctr. Christian. lib. iii. c. 9. Op. tom. iii. Pt. 1. col. 37.

[3] De signis disserens hoc dico, ne quis in eis adtendat quod sunt, sed potius quod signa sunt, id est, quod significant. Signum est enim res præter speciem, quam ingerit sensibus, aliud aliquid ex se faciens in cogitationem venire. Id. ib. lib. ii. c. 1. ib. col. 15.

[4] Ea demum est miserabilis animæ servitus, signa pro rebus accipere, et supra creaturam corpoream oculum mentis ad hauriendum æternum lumen levare non posse. Id. ib. lib. iii. c. 5. ib. col. 36.

[5] Nimis autem longum est, convenienter disputare de varietate signorum, quæ, cum ad res divinas pertinent, sacramenta appellantur. Id. Ep. ad Marcellin. ep. 138. § 7. Op. tom. ii. col. 313.

And he compares the sacraments of the New Testament with those of the Old, calling them both signs, and pointing out that their signification was the same. After noticing the identity of the faith of the saints of the Old and New Testament, and referring to 1 Cor. x. 1 et seq., "they were all baptized unto Moses, &c., and did all eat the same spiritual meat," &c., he remarks,—

"Amidst a diversity in the signs, the faith is the same .... they believed that the things would come, we that they have come. Therefore also he speaks thus, 'They drank the same spiritual drink:' the same *spiritual*, for the *corporal* was not the same. For what did they drink? 'They drank of the spiritual rock that followed them, but that rock was Christ.' Observe, therefore, that while the faith remained the same, the signs were varied. There *the rock* was Christ, to us *that which is placed on the altar of God* is Christ. And they for a wonderful *sacrament of the same Christ*, drank the water flowing from the rock; what we drink the faithful know. If you look to the visible form, it is different; if to the meaning to be understood, they drank *the same spiritual drink.*" [1]

Again he says, that sacraments are "visible signs of divine "things, but the invisible things themselves are honored in "them; and *the matter that has been sanctified by the bene-* "*diction is not to be looked upon as it is looked upon when* "*applied to ordinary uses.*" [2]

And again elsewhere more than once he calls a sacrament "a sacred sign." [3]

And with a clearness which it is impossible to dispute, he says, that "in sacraments it is always considered, not what they

[1] In signis diversis eadem fides.... illi [credebant] ventura esse, nos autem venisse. Ideo et sic ait, Eumdem potum spiritalem biberunt: spiritalem eumdem, nam corporalem non eumdem. Quid enim illi bibebant? Bibebant enim de spiritali sequente petra: petra autem erat Christus. Videte ergo, fide manente, signa variata. Ibi petra Christus, nobis Christus quod in altari Dei ponitur. Et illi pro magno sacramento ejusdem Christi biberunt aquam profluentem de petra; nos quid bibamus, norunt fideles. Si speciem visibilem intendas, aliud est: si intelligibilem significationem, eumdem potum spiritalem biberunt. Id. In Johann. tract. 45. § 9. Op. tom. iii. Pt. 2. col. 434.

[2] Signacula quidem rerum divinarum esse visibilia, sed res ipsas invisibiles in eis honorari; nec sic habendam esse illam speciem benedictione sanctificatam, quemadmodum habetur in usu quolibet. Id. De catech. rud. c. 26. Op. vi. 213.

[3] Sacrificium ergo visibile invisibilis sacrificii sacramentum, id est, sacrum signum est. Id. De Civ. Dei. lib. x. c. 5. Op. vii. 184. Sacramenta, id est, sacra signa, Id. Contra adv. Leg. et Proph. lib. ii. c. 9. Op. viii. 425.

are, but what they exhibit; since they are signs of things; BEING ONE THING, and SIGNIFYING ANOTHER."[1] They *are* one thing, and they only *signify* another.

And here I must notice the erroneous representation of Archdeacon Wilberforce as to Augustine's statements on this subject. He admits that Augustine says, that "by sacraments are meant, in general, those *signs* which are used with a sacred purpose." But he adds,—"But when he proceeds to define "them more exactly, he says that a sacrament consists of two "parts, one of which is an object to the senses, the other to the "mind. The first, therefore, has a visible and corporeal "nature; the second is that spiritual gift which it is the ob-"ject of the ordinance to convey;" and he refers for proof to "Sermo 271. vol. v. p. 1104."[2] Now though it be true, that taking the word "sacrament" as meaning *the whole rite*, it may properly be said to have two parts, and this may be shown from Augustine, yet as referring to the *elements*, as the Archdeacon here uses the word, this is not the case; and Augustine says nothing of the kind in the passage to which the Archdeacon sends his reader without venturing to quote it. The passage is this:—

"How is the bread his body? and the cup, or that which "the cup contains, how is it his blood? These things, brethren, "are therefore called sacraments, because one thing is seen in "them, another is *understood*. That which is seen has a cor-"poral form, that which is understood has spiritual fruit." And he proceeds to describe the bread as signifying the mystical body of Christ, consisting of true believers.[3]

Now this is precisely similar to the passage just quoted, where he says that sacraments *are* one thing and *signify* another. There is not the slightest ground for affixing to it the sense ascribed to it by the Archdeacon.

[1] Hæc enim sacramenta sunt, in quibus non quid sint, sed quid ostendant semper adtenditur: quoniam signa sunt rerum, aliud exsistentia et aliud significantia. ID. Contra Max. Arian. lib. ii. c. 22. § 3. Op. viii. 514.

[2] He means Sermo 272. vol. v. col. 1104.

[3] Quomodo est Sermo 272. panis corpus ejus? et calix, vel quod habet calix, quomodo est sanguis ejus? Ista, fratres, ideo dicuntur sacramenta, quia in eis aliud videtur, aliud intelligitur. Quod videtur speciem habet corporalem, quod intelligitur fructum habet spiritalem. ID. Serm. 272. Op. v. 770.

Now the only sense in which, according to the maintainers of transubstantiation, or consubstantiation, or any doctrine of a real bodily presence in or under the consecrated elements, the word *sign* can properly be used in connexion with the Eucharist, is with reference to that (supposed) *part* of the consecrated substances, which consists of bread and wine, or the accidents of bread and wine. And therefore the Romanists maintain, that when the Fathers called the sacraments signs, they meant by the word "sacraments," when they so used it, only the outward accidents of the bread and wine; and the defenders of consubstantiation say, that they meant only that *portion* of the consecrated substances that consists of bread and wine. But for this they have not the slightest ground, as the reader may judge from the passages just quoted. The word "sacrament" is clearly used in those passages to denote the whole consecrated sacramental substances; and in them, *the sacrament*, *i. e.*, the whole consecrated sacramental substance, is called a *sign*; which shows what was considered to be its true nature.

True, it is not a *mere* or *inoperative* sign in the case of those who receive it aright. Grace is connected by promise with the use of it. And therefore on this account, and in this respect, it is justly said, that *the rite* consists of *two parts*, the outward and visible sign and the inward and spiritual grace. Both enter into the rite in the case of all who rightly receive it, and for such only was it intended.

As Peter Lombard says, "That is properly called a sacra-
"ment, which is in such a manner a sign of the grace of God,
"and a form of invisible grace, as to bear its image and be its
"cause. The sacraments, therefore, [*i. e.* the sacramental
"rites,] were instituted not for the purpose of signifying only,
"but also of sanctifying. For the things which were instituted
"for the sake of signifying only, are only signs, and not sacra-
"ments."[1] And he tells us that "there are two things *of which a sacrament* [*i. e.* the outward sacramental rite] *consists*,

[1] Sacramentum enim proprie dicitur quod ita signum est gratiæ Dei et invisibilis gratiæ forma, ut ipsius imaginem gerat, et causa existat. Non ergo significandi tantum gratia sacramenta instituta sunt, sed etiam sanctificandi. Quæ enim significandi gratia tantum instituta sunt, solum signa sunt, et non sacramenta. Petri Lombard. Sentent. lib. iv. dist. 1. B. ed. Lugd. 1570. fol. 292.

namely words and a thing; words, as the invocation of the Trinity; a thing, as water, oil, and the like."[1]

But if there were two things or substances,—the Bread and Wine or their accidents, and the Body and Blood of Christ in a spiritual form,—existing together in the consecrated elements, it could not properly be said that *the sacrament* or whole consecrated sacramental substance is *a sign*. *The sacrament* would be a compound of *the sign and the thing signified*. And the term *sign* could be properly applied to that *part* of it only which was intended to have a significatory meaning.

One great cause of perplexity and confusion in this subject, arises from the different meanings in which the word "sacrament" is used; for it not unfrequently happens, as in the remarks just quoted from Peter Lombard, that the word is used in two different senses even in the same paragraph; in one place denoting *the consecrated sacramental substances*, in another *the sacramental rite as a whole*. And elsewhere, as in the last quoted passage of Peter Lombard, it may apply only to *the outward part of the rite*. And this enables those who are so inclined to support almost any statements by passages, both from the Fathers and other writers, and to throw the whole subject into almost inextricable confusion.

This induced Archbishop Cranmer to advertise his readers, in his Preface to his work on the Eucharist, that he, like the Fathers, used the word in different senses, lest they should "stumble" at his mode of using it. He says,—

"First, this word 'sacrament' I do sometimes use (as it is many times taken among writers and holy doctors) for the sacramental bread, water, or wine; as when they say, that *sacramentum est sacræ rei signum*, 'a sacrament is the sign of a holy thing.' But where I use to speak sometimes (as the old authors do) that Christ is in the sacraments, I mean the same as they did understand the matter; that is to say, not of Christ's carnal presence in the outward sacrament, but *sometimes* of his sacramental presence. And *sometimes* by this word 'sacrament' I mean the whole ministration and receiving of the sacraments, either of Baptism, or of the Lord's Supper; and so the old writers many times do say, that Christ and the Holy Ghost be present in the sacraments; not meaning by that

[1] Duo autem sunt in quibus sacramentum consistit, scilicet verba et res: verba, ut invocatio Trinitatis; res, ut aqua, oleum, et hujusmodi. Id. ib. D. fol. 293.

manner of speech, that Christ and the Holy Ghost be present in the water, bread, or wine (which be only the outward visible sacraments), but that in the due ministration of the sacraments according to Christ's ordinance and institution, Christ and his Holy Spirit be truly and indeed present by their mighty and sanctifying power, virtue, and grace, in all them that worthily receive the same." [1]

It is essential to our right understanding of this subject, and of the views which the authors we may be reading have entertained respecting it, to bear in mind this distinction in the meanings in which the word "sacrament" is used.

But I proceed to show that the Fathers have spoken still more definitely on the subject; for

(10.) *They expressly call the* CONSECRATED SACRAMENTAL SUBSTANCES *in the Eucharist* FIGURES, SIGNS, SYMBOLS, ANTITYPES, *&c., of the Body and Blood of Christ, and therefore could not hold them to be, or to include, the real Body and Blood of Christ.*

This appears from various passages already quoted.

As for instance in that of Tertullian;—"He made the bread, which he took and distributed to his disciples, his own body, by saying, 'This is my body;' that is, *a figure* of my body." [2]

And in that of Augustine;—"The Lord doubted not to say, 'This is my body,' when he was giving *a sign* of his body." [3]

And in those just quoted from Theodoret, especially where he says, that Christ "honored the visible symbols with the appellation of his body and blood." [4]

In fact, all the passages in which it is said, that what is called the Lord's body is bread, and what is called his blood is wine, virtually affirm, that the consecrated sacramental substances are figures and symbols of the Lord's body and blood.

But many others may be added of a direct kind, both from these and other Fathers.

Thus Tertullian elsewhere in the same work says, that our Lord "did not reject either the water of the Creator, with which he cleanses his followers, .... or bread, by which he represents his own very body." [5]

[1] CRANMER'S Answer to Gardiner. Preface. Works, P. S. ed. vol. i. p. 3.

[2] See p. 62 above. [3] See p. 70 above. [4] See p. 248 above.

[5] Ille quidem usque nunc nec aquam reprobavit Creatoris, qua suos abluit, .... nec panem, quo ipsum corpus suum repræsentat. TERTULL. Adv. Marc. lib. i. c. 14. Op. ed. cit. p. 372. Archdeacon Wilberforce (p. 236, or, 202) closely,

And again, commenting on a passage in Jeremiah, where he considers the word "bread" to occur with a prophetic reference to our Lord's *body*, he says to the Marcionites,—

"For thus hath God revealed in your Gospel also [*i. e.* the Gospel as received by the Marcionites], calling bread his own body, that hence also you may understand, that he gave to bread [to be] the figure of his body, whose body on the other hand the Prophet figuratively spoke of as bread, the Lord himself being about afterwards to interpret this sacrament (or, mystery)." [1]

Augustine also speaks in a similar way in various passages in his works.

Thus he calls our Lord's Last Supper "a feast in which he commended and delivered *the figure* of his own body and blood to his disciples." [2]

Again in a passage which, though it is written with reference to the eating of our Lord's flesh spoken of in John vi., is evidently as applicable to the Eucharist, Augustine says on the words, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you,"—

"He seems to command what is wicked or flagitious; therefore it is *a figure*, directing us to hold communion with our Lord's passion, and sweetly and profitably lay up in our memory, that his flesh was crucified and wounded for us." [3]

Again he says,—

"The flesh and blood of this sacrifice, before the coming of Christ,

as usual, following Bellarmine (De Euch. ii. 7.), wishes to make out that *repræsentat* in this passage means *makes present*. Now that the word *repræsentare* might be used in that sense, I do not deny, but it certainly cannot be so used in such a passage as that before us. For how can a real body be *made present* BY BREAD? Figuratively it may, but certainly not really.

[1] Sic enim Deus in Evangelio quoque vestro revelavit, panem corpus suum appellans, ut et hinc jam eum intelligas corporis sui figuram pani dedisse, cujus retro corpus in panem Prophetes figuravit, ipso Domino hoc sacramentum postea interpretaturo. TERTULL. Adv. Marc. lib. iii. c. 19. Op. p. 408.

[2] Eum [i.e. Judam] . . . adhibuit ad convivium in quo corporis et sanguinis sui figuram discipulis commendavit et tradidit. AUGUST. Enarr. in Psalm. iii. 1. Op. iv. 6.

[3] Facinus vel flagitium videtur jubere: figura est ergo, præcipiens passioni Dominicæ communicandum, et suaviter atque utiliter recondendum in memoria, quod pro nobis caro ejus crucifixa et vulnerata sit. ID. De doctr. Christ. lib. iii. c. 16. Op. iii. pt. 1. col. 40.

was promised by victims of similitude; in the passion of Christ, was rendered in very truth; after Christ's ascension, is celebrated by *a sacrament of remembrance*." [1]

Again he says,—

"That which by all is called a sacrifice, is *a sign* of the true sacrifice." [2]

Where, if our authors object, that this is not spoken of the Eucharist, I must ask them, what it is which is here spoken of.

And elsewhere, speaking of the sacraments of the Old and New Testaments, he says,—

"The Sacraments of the Old Testament were promises of things to be fulfilled, those of the New Testament are *tokens* of things already fulfilled . . . What wonder is it, if the future passion and resurrection of Christ were promised by *one kind of images of mysteries*, and the same, when accomplished, are *announced by another kind* [*of images of mysteries*] . . . *For what else are* ALL *corporal sacraments but certain as it were visible words*, very holy indeed, but nevertheless mutable and transient." [3]

So in another passage already quoted,[4] Augustine clearly expresses the same view, where he says, that, from the *similitude* of sacraments to those things of which they are sacraments, they for the most part receive the names even of the things themselves; adding,—

"As therefore after a certain manner [i.e. by similitude], the sacrament of the Body of Christ is the Body of Christ, the sacrament of the Blood of Christ is the Blood of Christ, so the sacrament of faith is faith."

This passage is evidently that which Prosper had chiefly in his eye in that extract from Augustine of which we have a mani-

[1] Hujus sacrificii caro et sanguis ante adventum Christi per victimas similitudinum promittebatur; in passione Christi per ipsam veritatem reddebatur; post adscensum Christi per sacramentum memoriæ celebratur. ID. Contra Faust. lib. xx. c. 21. Op. viii. 247.

[2] Illud quod ab omnibus appellatur sacrificium, signum est veri sacrificii. ID. De Civ. Dei. x. 5. Op. vii. 185.

[3] Illa fuerint promissiones rerum complendarum, hæc sint indicia completarum . . . Quid mirum si aliis mysteriorum signaculis passio et resurrectio Christi futura promissa est, aliis jam facta annuntiatur. . . . Quid enim sunt aliud quæque corporalia sacramenta, nisi quædam quasi verba visibilia, sacro-sancta quidem, verumtamen mutabilia et temporalia? ID. Contra Faust. lib. xix. c. 14 and 16. Op. viii. 228.

[4] See p. 241 above.

festly garbled representation in the Decree of Gratian in the Canon Law, as it is now published.

The passage as it now stands in the Canon Law, professedly taken from Prosper's "Book of Sentences from Augustine," runs thus, and is a curious specimen of the way in which antient orthodoxy has been often garbled and corrupted by later additions,—

"As therefore the heavenly bread, *which is truly the flesh of Christ*, after a manner is called the body of Christ, when it is in truth the sacrament of the body of Christ, of that body to wit which visible, palpable, and mortal, hung upon the cross; and the very *immolation of the flesh* which is made by the hands of the priest, is called the passion, death, crucifixion of Christ, not in the truth of the reality, but in a significant mystery; so the sacrament of faith, which means baptism, is faith." [1]

The words in italics are clearly corruptions of the original, being wholly inconsistent with the remainder of the passage, and also with the views of Augustine expressed in the passage referred to.[2]

Enough however remains for our purpose, for nothing can reconcile parts of this passage with the notion of a real bodily presence in the elements.

Still more remarkable is the fact, that on this place an antient gloss has been allowed to remain, which no ingenuity can torture into anything but a direct advocacy of the view for which I am here contending. A gloss on the words *heavenly bread* in the above extract runs thus:—

"That is, the heavenly sacrament, which truly represents the flesh of Christ. It is called the Body of Christ, but improperly. Whence it is called so 'after a manner,' but 'not in the truth of the reality, but in a significant mystery;' so that the meaning is, It is called the Body of Christ, that is, it signifies it." [3]

[1] Sicut ergo cœlestis panis, qui vere Christus [Christi] caro est, suo modo vocatur corpus Christi, cum revera sit sacramentum corporis Christi, illius videlicet, quod visibile, palpabile, mortale in cruce est suspensum; vocaturque ipsa immolatio carnis, quæ sacerdotis manibus fit, Christi passio, mors, crucifixio, non rei veritate, sed significante mysterio: sic sacramentum fidei, quod baptismus intelligitur, fides est. PSEUD-AUGUST. in Libro Sentent. Prosp. ut cit. Gratian. Decr. P. iii. De Consecr. dist. 2. c. 48. *Hoc est.*—Corp. Jur. Canon. ed. Lugd. 1624. tom. i. col. 1937.

[2] In Prosper's "Book of Sentences from Augustine," as now published, the passage does not, I think, appear at all.

[3] Id est, cœleste sacramentum, quod vere repræsentat Christi carnem: dicitur

Again Theodoret also elsewhere calls "the Divine mysteries" "antitypes of the true body" of Christ.[1] And in another remarkable passage, refuting the error of those who supposed that the flesh of Christ was changed into the nature of the Deity, he says,—"But if his flesh was changed into the nature of the "Deity, for what purpose do they receive *the antitypes* of his "body? For *a type* is superfluous when the reality represented "by it is gone."[2]

And again, on the words, "As often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death *till he come*" (1 Cor. xi. 26.), he says,—

"For truly after his presence is vouchsafed, there will no longer be any need of the *symbols of his body*, the body itself appearing."[3]

Abundant testimonies to the same effect occur in other Fathers.

Thus Origen, in a passage which will be found more fully quoted below, speaking of "the sanctified meat"[4] received in the Eucharist, and observing that "it is not the matter of the bread, "but the word spoken over it that profits him who eats it not "unworthily of the Lord,"[5] adds, "And thus much concerning THE TYPICAL AND SYMBOLICAL BODY."[6]

So the Author of the Dialogue on right faith in God, against the Marcionites, attributed to Origen, says,—

"But if, as they say, Christ had not flesh and blood; of what flesh, or what body, or what blood, did he give the bread and cup as

corpus Christi, sed improprie. Unde dicitur suo modo, sed non rei veritate, sed significati mysterio; ut sit sensus, Vocatur Christi corpus, id est, significat. Gloss. in Decr. P. iii. De cons. dist. 2. c. 48. verb. *cæleste*.—Corp. Jur. Canon. ed. 1624. i. 1937.

[1] Τοῦ ὄντως σώματος ἀντίτυπά ἐστι τὰ θεῖα μύστηρια. THEODORET. Dial. 2. Inconf. Op. iv. 125.

[2] Εἰ δὲ ἡ σὰρξ εἰς θεότητος μετεβλήθη φύσιν, τοῦ [mispr. οὗ] δὴ χάριν μεταλαμβάνουσι τῶν ἀντιτύπων τοῦ σώματος; περιττὸς γὰρ ὁ τύπος ἀνηρημένης τῆς ἀληθείας. ID. Demonstr. quod immut. sit Deus Verb.; ad fin. Dial. 3. Op. iv. 269.

[3] Μετὰ γὰρ δὴ τὴν αὐτοῦ παρουσίαν, οὐκέτι χρεία τῶν συμβόλων τοῦ σώματος, αὐτοῦ φαινομένου τοῦ σώματος. ID. Comment. in 1 Cor. xi. 26. Op. tom. iii. p. 238.

[4] Τὸ ἁγιαζόμενον βρῶμα.

[5] Οὐχ ἡ ὕλη τοῦ ἄρτου, ἀλλ' ὁ ἐπ' αὐτῷ εἰρημένος λόγος ἐστὶν ὁ ὠφελῶν τὸν μὴ ἀναξίως τοῦ Κυρίου ἐσθίοντα αὐτόν.

[6] Καὶ ταῦτα μὲν περὶ τοῦ τυπικοῦ καὶ συμβολικοῦ σώματος. ORIGEN. Comment. in Matth. tom. xi. § 14. Op. ed. cit. iii. 499, 500.

*images*, and commanded his disciples to make *a remembrance of him through them?*" [1]

Here, though the words used are "the bread and cup," yet the term "images" is applied to *those things through which the remembrance is made*, which are the sacramental substances as they exist *after consecration*.

Thus also Cyprian more than once says, that "by the wine the blood of Christ is represented." [2] It is true, a cavil may be raised respecting these passages of Cyprian, that we cannot *prove*, from the words used, that they apply to the sacramental substances *after consecration;* and therefore, if any one is so disposed, he may strike the passages out of the list. But they occur in the same letter in which he uses the expressions, above quoted from him,[3] that the Lord *called wine his blood, &c.*, and therefore there can be little doubt as to his meaning.

Clement of Alexandria expressly advocates the same view, observing,—

"And he blessed wine, saying, Take, drink; this is my blood, the blood of the vine. He allegorically gives this name to the Word, shed [i.e. whose blood was shed, as Archbishop Potter interprets it] for many for the remission of sins, a holy stream of gladness." [4]

Which words show, says Archbishop Potter in his note on the place, that his sentiments on the Eucharist agreed with those of Tertullian, "who expounded the body of Christ to mean the figure of his body;" referring to the passage just quoted from Tertullian.

And just before this passage we find the following,—

[1] Εἰ δ', ὡς οὗτοί φασιν, ἄσαρκος καὶ ἄναιμος ἦν, ποίας σαρκὸς, ἢ τίνος σώματος, ἢ ποίου αἵματος εἰκόνας διδοὺς ἄρτον τε καὶ ποτήριον, ἐνετέλλετο τοῖς μαθηταῖς, διὰ τούτων τὴν ἀνάμνησιν αὐτοῦ ποιεῖσθαι. ANONYMI Dialog. de recta in Deum fide adv. Marc.; sect. 4.—Inter Origen. Op. ed. cit. i. 853.

[2] Vinum . . . . quo Christi sanguis ostenditur.—In vino ostendi sanguinem Christi. CYPRIAN. Ep. ad Cæcil. ep. 63. Op. ed. cit. pt. 2. pp. 148, 153. A phrase to the same effect occurs also in p. 152, where, arguing for the mixture of wine and water against those who wished to use water only in the Eucharist, he says of the water, *quæ sola Christi sanguinem non possit exprimere.*

[3] See p. 237 above.

[4] Καὶ εὐλογησέν γε τὸν οἶνον, εἰπὼν, Λάβετε, πίετε· τοῦτό μου ἐστὶ τὸ αἷμα, αἷμα τῆς ἀμπέλου· τὸν Λογον, τὸν περὶ πολλῶν ἐκχεόμενον εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, εὐφροσύνης ἅγιον ἀλληγορεῖ νάμα. CLEM. ALEX. Pædag. lib. ii. c. 2. Op. ed. Potter. 1715. i. 186.

"Therefore the Scripture called wine a mystic symbol of the holy blood." [1]

Thus also speaks Ambrose :—

"First the shadow preceded, the image followed, the reality will be. The shadow in the Law, the image in the Gospel, the reality in heavenly things. The shadow of the Gospel and of the Church of the assembly in the Law, the image of the future reality in the Gospel, the reality in the judgment of God. Therefore a shadow of those things which are now celebrated in the Church was in the discourses of the prophets; a shadow in the deluge; a shadow in the Red Sea; when our fathers were baptized in the cloud and in the sea; a shadow in the rock which poured forth water and followed the people. Was not that, in a shadow, a sacrament [i.e. a sign] of this holy mystery? Was not the water from the rock, in a shadow, as it were, blood from Christ which followed the people who departed from it, that they might drink and not thirst, that they might be redeemed and not perish? But now the shadow of the night and darkness of the Jews has departed, the day of the Church has arrived. Now we see good things by an image, and we have the blessings of the image. . . . . Christ himself stands by the Father as our Advocate: but now we do not see him; we shall then see him, when *the image shall have passed away and the reality shall have come.* Then the things which are perfect shall be seen no longer through a glass, but face to face. Ascend therefore, O man, into heaven, and you shall see those things of which here there was *the shadow or the image.*" [2]

Similar remarks occur also in another work of Ambrose, where he says,—

[1] Μυστικὸν ἄρα σύμβολον ἡ γραφὴ αἵματος ἁγίου, οἶνον ὠνόμασεν. Id. ib. p. 184.

[2] Primum igitur umbra præcessit, secuta est imago, erit veritas. Umbra in Lege, imago vero in Evangelio, veritas in cœlestibus. Umbra Evangelii et Ecclesiæ congregationis in Lege, imago futuræ veritatis in Evangelio, veritas in judicio Dei. Ergo quæ nunc celebrantur in Ecclesia, eorum umbra erat in sermonibus prophetarum; umbra in diluvio, umbra in Rubro mari; quando baptizati sunt patres nostri in nube et in mari; umbra in petra, quæ aquam fluxit, et populum sequebatur. Nonne illud in umbra erat sacrosancti hujus mysterii sacramentum? Nonne in umbra erat aqua de petra, quasi sanguis ex Christo, quæ fugientes se populos sequebatur, ut biberent, et non sitirent; redimerentur, et non perirent? Sed jam discessit umbra noctis et caliginis Judæorum, dies appropinquavit Ecclesiæ. Videmus nunc per imaginem bona, et tenemus imaginis bona . . . . Et ipse [*i.e.* Christus] quidem nobis apud Patrem advocatus assistit: sed nunc eum non videmus; tunc videbimus, cum imago transierit, veritas venerit. Tunc jam non per speculum, sed facie ad faciem ea quæ sunt perfecta videbuntur. Ascende ergo, homo, in cœlum, et videbis illa quorum umbra hic erat vel imago. Ambros. Enarr. in Psalm. 38. §§ 25, 26. Op. tom. i. col. 852, 853.

"Therefore those things are to be sought by us in which there is perfection, in which there is the reality. The shadow in the Law, the image in the Gospel, the reality in heavenly things. Formerly a lamb was offered, and a calf was offered; now Christ is offered; but he is offered as a man, as undergoing suffering; and he himself as a priest offers himself, that he may take away our sins; *here in an image*, there in reality, where in the presence of the Father he mediates as an advocate for us." [1]

The treatises ascribed to Ambrose, entitled "De sacramentis" and "De mysteriis," if not altogether from another hand, are, there can be little doubt, much interpolated. The genuineness of the former, in its present state, is in fact given up by Baronius, and Du Pin, and other like authorities among the Romanists themselves; and Du Pin blames the Benedictines for admitting it among the genuine works of Ambrose. They are works which being written for catechumens would be peculiarly liable to interpolation by those who used them for the same purpose at a subsequent period. But among other passages savouring of a subsequent age, there are also some utterly inconsistent with the notion of the real body and blood being present in the consecrated elements, and clearly maintaining the doctrine of a figurative presence only. Thus it is said, after speaking of the elements becoming by consecration the Body and Blood of Christ (which all admit that they do *sacramentally*),—

"But perhaps you say, I do not see the appearance of blood. But it has the likeness; for *like as thou hast taken the likeness of his death*, [i. e. in baptism] *so also do you drink the likeness of his precious blood.*" [2]

And again,—

[1] Illa igitur nobis expetenda, in quibus perfectio, in quibus veritas est. Hic umbra, hic imago, illic veritas. Umbra in Lege, imago in Evangelio, veritas in cœlestibus. Ante agnus offerebatur, offerebatur et vitulus, nunc Christus offertur: sed offertur quasi homo, quasi recipiens passionem; et offert se ipse quasi sacerdos, ut peccata nostra dimittat: hic in imagine, ibi in veritate, ubi apud Patrem pro nobis quasi advocatus intervenit. Id. De offic. ministr. lib. i. c. 48. Op. ii. pt. 1. col. 63.

[2] Sed forte dicis: Speciem sanguinis non video. Sed habet similitudinem: sicut enim mortis similitudinem sumpsisti, ita etiam similitudinem pretiosi sanguinis bibis. Pseud-Ambros. De sacram. inter Op. Ambrosii, lib. iv. c. 4. Op. tom. ii. pt. 1. col. 370, 371.

"Thou receivest the sacrament for a likeness."[1]

And in the account given of the words used at the offering of the elements, the offering is distinctly called "*a figure* of the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ."[2] But this, no doubt, was before the use of the words considered by the Romanists to effect the consecration, and therefore I admit that it does not *prove* the point now in question.

So the Author of the Commentary on the Epistles of St. Paul attributed to Ambrose, generally considered to be Hilary the deacon, writing on the words, "As often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do *show* the Lord's death, till he come" (1 Cor. xi. 26), says,—

"For since we are liberated by the death of the Lord, mindful of this thing, we *signify* in our eating and drinking the flesh and blood which were offered for us, having obtained a new Covenant by these things," &c. . . . . "The Covenant was established by blood, inasmuch as blood is the witness of the divine mercy. For *a type* of which we take the *mystic cup of blood* for the protection of our body and soul."[3]

So Jerome says, that our Lord,—

"For a type of his blood did not offer water but wine."[4]

And again, on Jer. xxxi. 12, expounding the words, "for wheat, and wine, and oil," he says,—

"Of which the bread of the Lord is made, and the type of his

[1] In similitudinem accipis sacramentum. Id. ib. lib. vi. c. 1. ib. col. 380.

[2] Vis scire quia verbis cœlestibus consecratur? Accipe quæ sunt verba. Dicit sacerdos: Fac nobis, inquit, hanc oblationem ascriptam, ratam, rationabilem, acceptabilem: quod figura est corporis et sanguinis Domini nostri Jesu Christi. Qui pridie quam pateretur, in sanctis manibus suis accepit panem, &c. Id. ib. lib. iv. c. 5. ib. col. 371.

[3] Quia enim morte Domini liberati sumus, hujus rei memores, in edendo et potando carnem et sanguinem, quæ pro nobis oblata sunt, significamus, novum Testamentum in his consecuti, &c. . . . Testamentum ergo sanguine constitutum est: quia beneficii divini sanguis testis est. In cujus typum nos calicem mysticum sanguinis ad tuitionem corporis et animæ nostræ percipimus. Pseud-Ambros. seu Hilar. Diac. Comment. in 1 Cor. xi. 26. Inter Ambrosii Op. tom. ii. pt. 2. App. col. 149.

[4] In typo sanguinis sui non obtulit aquam sed vinum. Hieron. Adv. Jovin. lib. ii. § 5. Op. ed. cit. tom. ii. col. 330.

blood is perfected, and the blessing of sanctification is represented." [1]

And again elsewhere on Matth. xxvi. 26,—

"After the typical Passover was completed, and he had eaten the flesh of the lamb with the Apostles, he takes bread, which comforts the heart of man, and passes to the true sacrament of the Passover; that as, in præfiguration of him, Melchisedek, the high priest of God, had done, offering bread and wine, so he himself might represent the truth, (or, reality) of his own body and blood." [2]

So also Theophilus of Alexandria in his Paschal Epistle, as translated by Jerome, written in the year 402, speaks of "the bread of the Lord, by which the Saviour's Body is shown (or, represented)." [3]

So Ephræm Syrus says,—

"Observe, how, blessing the bread, he breaks it to be a type of his own immaculate body; and the cup also, how he blesses it to be a type of his blood, and gives them to his disciples." [4]

And Gelasius says, that "the *image* and *similitude* of the body and blood of Christ, are celebrated in the sacramental rite." [5]

[1] "Super frumento," inquit, "et vino et oleo;" de quo conficitur panis Domini, et sanguinis ejus impletur typus, et benedictio sanctificationis ostenditur. Id. Comment. in Jerem. c. xxxi. v. 12. Op. iv. 1063.

[2] Postquam typicum Pascha fuerat impletum, et agni carnes cum apostolis comederat, assumit panem, qui confortat cor hominis, et ad verum Paschæ transgreditur sacramentum, ut quomodo in præfiguratione ejus Melchisedek, summi Dei sacerdos, panem et vinum offerens fecerat, ipse quoque veritatem sui corporis et sanguinis repræsentaret. Id. Comment. in Matth. xxvi. 26. Op. ed. Erasmo. Basil. 1516. tom. ix. fol. 38. I quote this passage from this edition by Erasmus, on account of its having been shamefully falsified in the Benedictine and that of Vallarsius, where the word *veritatem* has been changed to *in veritate;* (ed. Vallars. vii. 216.) an alteration which, though pretending to rest on the authority of MSS., so obviously makes the passage nonsense, and incapable of any grammatical construction, that no argument is needed to convict it of error. Such corruptions have been largely introduced by the Romanists into the writings of the Fathers.

[3] Panem Dominicum, quo Salvatoris corpus ostenditur. Theoph. Alex. Paschal. Epist. 2a. a. 402. interprete Hieron.—Inter Hieron. Epist. ep. xcviii. § 13. Op. i. col. 595.

[4] Πρόσεχε, πῶς τὸν ἄρτον εὐλογῶν κλάει αὐτὸν ἐν τύπῳ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ ἰδίου ἀχράντου, καὶ τὸ ποτήριον πάλιν, πῶς ἐν τύπῳ αἵματος εὐλογεῖ, καὶ δίδωσιν τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ μαθηταῖς. Ephræm. Syr. Tract. de iis qui Filii Dei naturam scrutantur. Op. ed. Romæ 1732 et seq. tom. iii. p. 423.

[5] Certe imago et similitudo corporis et sanguinis Christi in actione mysteriorum celebrantur. Gelas. De duabus naturis in Christo. § 24. Inter Script. Vet. Lat. ed. Simler. Tigur. 1571. fol. 84.

The testimony of Eusebius of Cæsarea is very full and explicit in support of the same doctrine. He says that our Lord having offered himself up as a sacrifice to God for us, "directed us continually to offer to God *a memorial instead of a sacrifice;*" and that we have been "instructed to celebrate *a* "*memorial* of this sacrifice [of Christ] upon the table *through* "*symbols*, both of his body and his life-giving blood, according "to the institutes of the New Testament;" and he proceeds to point out, that the sacrifices of the New Testament are the "immaterial and mental sacrifices" offered by us, when we offer the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, and "celebrate the memorial of the great sacrifice according to the mysteries delivered by him."[1]

And again, expounding the words, "His eyes shall be red with wine, and his teeth white with milk," in Gen. xlix. 12, he says:—

"I think that they comprehend in mystical language the mysteries of the New Testament of our Saviour; namely, the saying, 'His eyes shall be joyful with wine,' seems to me to signify the joy flowing from that mystic wine which he delivered to his disciples, saying, 'Take, drink, this is my blood, &c.;' and the saying, 'His teeth white as milk,' the splendor and purity of the mystic nourishment. For he also delivered to his disciples the symbols of the Divine dispensation [of his incarnation], ordering them *to be made a representation of his own body*. For since he no longer looked with favor on the sacrifices made by bloodshedding, nor those ordained by Moses in the slaughter of different animals, but directed them to use *bread as the symbol of his own body*, perhaps he ænigmatically intimated the brightness and purity of the nourishment when he said, 'And his teeth shall be white as milk.'"[2]

[2] Μετὰ δὴ πάντα οἷόν τι θαυμάσιον θῦμα, καὶ σφάγιον ἐξαίρετον τῷ Πατρὶ καλλιερησάμενος, ὑπὲρ τῆς ἁπάντων ἡμῶν ἀνήνεγκε σωτηρίας, μνήμην καὶ ἡμῖν παραδοὺς ἀντὶ θυσίας τῷ Θεῷ διηνεκῶς προσφέρειν.... Τούτου δῆτα τοῦ θύματος τὴν μνήμην ἐπὶ τραπέζης ἐκτελεῖν διὰ συμβόλων, τοῦ τε σώματος αὐτοῦ, καὶ τοῦ σωτηρίου αἵματος κατὰ θεσμοὺς τῆς Καινῆς Διαθήκης παρειληφότες, κ. τ. λ. Eusebii Cæsar. Demonstr. Evang. lib. i. c. 10. Ed. Colon. 1688. pp. 38—40.

[2] Ἀπορρήτως τῆς Καινῆς τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Διαθήκης τὰ μυστήρια ἡγοῦμαι περιέχειν. Τὴν γοῦν εὐφροσύνην τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ μυστικοῦ οἴνου, οὗ παραδέδωκεν αὐτὸς τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ μαθηταῖς λέγων, Λάβετε, πίετε, τοῦτο μού ἐστι τὸ αἷμα, κ. τ. λ., δοκεῖ μοι σημαίνειν τὸ, χαροποιοὶ οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ οἴνου· καὶ τὸ, λευκοὶ οἱ ὀδόντες αὐτοῦ ἢ γάλα, τὸ λαμπρὸν καὶ καθαρὸν τῆς μυστηριώδους τροφῆς. Πάλιν γὰρ αὐτὸς τὰ σύμβολα τῆς ἐνθέου οἰκονομίας τοῖς αὐτοῦ παρεδίδου μαθηταῖς, τὴν εἰκόνα τοῦ ἰδίου σώματος ποιεῖσθαι παρακελευόμενος. Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ οὐκέτι τὰς δι' αἱμάτων θυσίας,

So Gregory of Nazianzum calls *the consecrated elements*, "antitypes of Christ's precious Body and Blood,"[1] and says that "we receive the Passover for the present *still typically*, though more clearly than under the old Dispensation;" "for," he adds, "I will venture to say, the legal Passover was an obscure type of *a type*."[2]

Nothing can well be clearer than this statement, that we still *receive* only *typically*, as they did under the Old Testament, but by a plainer type.

Thus, also, Chrysostom expressly calls the *consecrated* elements *symbols*, remarking, "If Jesus did not die, of what are the consecrated elements *the symbols?*"[3]

And in another passage, not the less forcible from the testimony being indirect, he clearly intimates, that the consecrated bread is called the body of Christ, not in a *proper* but in an *adapted* sense. Interpreting Gal. v. 17, he says that the word *flesh* here is not to be taken literally for the body, but as meaning *earthly and idle thoughts*:[4] and that if any one bring an objection from the appellation,[5] he must make similar objections in other cases. And then he adds,—"And further, the Scripture "is *accustomed to call* the mysteries also, and the whole Church, "by *the name* of the flesh, saying that they are the body of "Christ."[6]

The phrase, "accustomed to call by the name," shows at once what is meant; as also does the coupling of the "mysteries" with "the whole Church" as bearing *the name*. Indeed, Chry-

οὐδὲ τὰς παρὰ Μωσεῖ ἐν διαφόρων ζώων σφαγαῖς νενομοθετημένας προσίετο, ἄρτῳ δὲ χρῆσθαι συμβόλῳ τοῦ ἰδίου σώματος παρεδίδου, εἰκότως τὸ λαμπρὸν καὶ καθαρὸν ἡνίξατο τῆς τροφῆς, εἰπὼν, καὶ λευκοί, κ. τ. λ. Id. ib. lib. viii. ib. p. 380.

[1] Εἰ πού τι τῶν ἀντιτύπων τοῦ τιμίου σώματος ἡ τοῦ αἵματος ἡ χεὶρ ἐθησαύρισεν, τοῦτο καταμιγνῦσα τοῖς δάκρυσιν, κ. τ. λ. Gregor. Naz. Orat. viii. § 18. Op. ed. Ben. Par. tom. i. p. 229. The words are spoken of his sister.

[2] Μεταληψόμεθα δὲ τοῦ Πάσχα, νῦν μὲν τυπικῶς ἔτι, καὶ εἰ τοῦ παλαιοῦ γυμνότερον· τὸ γὰρ νομικὸν Πάσχα, τολμῶ καὶ λέγω, τύπου τύπος ἦν ἀμυδρότερος. Id. Orat. 45. § 23. ib. p. 863.

[3] Εἰ γὰρ μὴ ἀπέθανεν ὁ Ιησοῦς, τίνος σύμβολα τὰ τελούμενα; Chrys. In Matth. hom. 82. § 1. Op. vii. 783.

[4] Σάρκα ἐνταῦθα τὸν λογισμὸν καλεῖ τὸν γεώδη, τὸν ῥᾴθυμον καὶ ἠμελημένον.

[5] Ἀπὸ τῆς προσηγορίας.

[6] Τῷ δὲ τῆς σαρκὸς ὀνόματι πάλιν καὶ τὰ μυστήρια καλεῖν εἴωθεν ἡ γραφὴ, καὶ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἅπασαν, σῶμα λέγουσα εἶναι τοῦ Χριστοῦ. Chrys. Comment. in Galat. v. 17. Op. x. 720.

sostom's argument is destroyed, if you suppose the "mysteries" to *be* really the body of Christ.

And in a Homily on Psalm xxii., published as his in his Works as printed at Paris in 1588, we read on the words "Thou hast prepared a table before me," &c.,—

"And inasmuch as Wisdom hath prepared that table for her servants and handmaids in their sight, that she might daily show us, in the sacrament, *bread and wine* according to the order of Melchisedech, for *a representation of the body and blood of Christ*, therefore he says, 'Thou hast prepared a table before me,'" &c.[1]

And in the Commentary on Matthew, attributed to Chrysostom, and admitted to be a work of considerable value, we find the author thus speaking of the vessels used for the administration of the Eucharist.—"*In which there is not the true body of Christ, but the mystery of his body is contained.*"[2]

With this exactly corresponds the language of Facundus bishop of Hermiana, as already quoted in a previous page.[3] He says,—

"We call the sacrament of his body and blood, which is in the consecrated bread and cup, his body and blood; *not that the bread is properly his body and the cup his blood, but because they contain in themselves the mystery of his body and blood.*"

To these we may add Fulgentius, who speaks thus;—

"Hold firmly and beyond all doubt, that the only-begotten God the Word made flesh, offered himself for us a sacrifice and an offering to God for a sweet-smelling savour..... to whom now, that is, in the time of the New Testament, with the Father and the Holy

[1] Nam vide quid dicit Sapientia: 'Sapientia ædificavit sibi domum, supposuit columnas septem, paravit mensam suam,' &c.... Et quia istam mensam præparavit servis et ancillis in conspectu eorum, ut quotidie in similitudinem corporis et sanguinis Christi, panem et vinum secundum ordinem Melchisedeck nobis ostenderet in sacramento, ideo dicit: Parasti in conspectu meo mensam, &c. CHRYS. Homil. in Ps. xxii. et cxvi. Op. ed. Paris. 1588. tom. i. col. 703.

[2] Si ergo hæc vasa sanctificata ad privatos usus transferre sic periculosum est; in quibus non est verum corpus Christi, sed mysterium corporis ejus continetur; quanto magis vasa corporis nostri, &c. Opus imperf. in Matth. hom. xi. Inter Op. CHRYSOST. tom. vi. App. p. lxiii. The Benedictine Editors take care to inform us, respecting the words quoted above, that "hæc in quibusdam exemplaribus desunt;" which is not surprising.

[3] See p. 243 above.

Spirit, with whom there is one divinity with him, the holy Catholic Church throughout the whole world ceases not to offer, in faith and charity, *the sacrifice of bread and wine*. For in the former carnal victims [*i. e.* those of the Old Testament] there was a signification of the flesh of Christ which he without sin was about to offer for our sins, and of the blood which he was about to pour forth for the remission of our sins; but in the latter sacrifice [*i. e.* that of the bread and wine] there is a thanksgiving and a *commemoration* of the flesh of Christ, which he offered for us, and of the blood which the same Divine Person shed for us." [1]

Now I do not here insist upon the words "sacrifice of bread and wine," because it may be replied, (though certainly not, with any consistency, by Archdeacon Wilberforce, who holds the sacrifice to be that of the elements changed so as to at least *include* the Body and Blood), that the sacrifice was offered before the consecration of the elements. But I beg the reader at least to observe, that according to Fulgentius the Eucharistic rite consists of a thanksgiving and a COMMEMORATION of the crucified flesh and shed blood of our Lord.

And the Author of the Apostolical Constitutions, falsely ascribed to Clement of Rome, speaks of "the mysteries" as "antitypes of Christ's precious body and blood;" [2] and in the form of the Eucharistic thanksgiving which he gives, he has these words,—"We also give thanks to thee, our Father, for "the precious blood of Jesus Christ that was poured out for us, "and for the precious body; which also we celebrate by these "*antitypes*; he himself having commanded us to show forth "his death." [3]

[1] Firmissime tene, et nullatenus dubites, ipsum unigenitum Deum Verbum carnem factum, se pro nobis obtulisse sacrificium et hostiam Deo in odorem suavitatis.... cui nunc, id est tempore Novi Testamenti, cum Patre et Spiritu Sancto, cum quibus illi est una divinitas, sacrificium panis et vini, in fide et caritate sancta Catholica Ecclesia per universum orbem terræ offerre non cessat. In illis enim carnalibus victimis, significatio fuit carnis Christi, quam pro peccatis nostris ipse sine peccato fuerat oblaturus, et sanguinis quem erat effusurus in remissionem peccatorum nostrorum: in isto autem sacrificio, gratiarum actio atque commemoratio est carnis Christi, quam pro nobis obtulit, et sanguinis quem pro nobis idem Deus effudit. FULGENTII RUSP. De fide ad Petrum. c. 19. Op. ed. Paris. 1684. p. 525.

[2] Παραδοὺς δὲ ἡμῖν τὰ ἀντίτυπα μυστήρια τοῦ τιμίου σώματος αὐτοῦ καὶ αἵματος. PSEUDO-CLEM. ROM. Const. Apost. lib. v. c. 14. Inter Patr. Apost. ed. Coteler. Amstel. 1724. vol. i. p. 320.

[3] Ἔτι εὐχαριστοῦμεν, πάτερ ἡμῶν, ὑπὲρ τοῦ τιμίου αἵματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ

Thus also the Author, who goes by the name of Dionysius the Areopagite, and in whose works, though probably much interpolated, there are many parts savouring of an early period of the Christian Church, clearly recognises the consecrated substances as in themselves merely symbols. Thus he speaks of "the venerable *symbols* being placed upon the altar, by which Christ is represented and *partaken of*;"[1] and still more clearly in the following passage, where, after speaking of the consecration of the elements, he says, that then the minister, having prayed that he may be worthy to perform this sacred service, &c., "celebrates the divine mysteries, and brings to sight the "things over which the praises of God have been uttered, by *the* "*symbols* sacredly lying before him. For having uncovered "*the bread*, which had been covered over and undivided, and "separating it into many parts, and having divided among them "all the one cup, he symbolically multiplies and distributes "the unity, consummating in these things the most holy divine "service."[2]

And on the words "figures" and "symbols," used by him with reference to the elements,[3] his scholiast Maximus (who wrote A.D. 630) remarks as follows:—on the former he says,—"He called the things now done in the Communion, figures of the reality;"[4] and on the latter,—"Because these are symbols and not the reality."[5]

Again, he calls them "images;"[6] on which Maximus remarks,—"He calls by the name of images the figures of things

ἐκχυθέντος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν· καὶ τοῦ τιμίου σώματος· οὗ καὶ ἀντίτυπα ταῦτα ἐπιτελοῦμεν, αὐτοῦ διαταξαμένου ἡμῖν καταγγέλλειν τὸν αὐτοῦ θάνατον. ID. ib. lib. vii. c. 25. Ibid. p. 373.

[1] Ἐπιτεθέντων τῷ θείῳ θυσιαστηρίῳ τῶν σεβασμίων συμβόλων, δι' ὧν ὁ Χριστὸς σημαίνεται καὶ μετέχεται. PSEUDO-DIONYS. AREOP. De Eccles. Hierarch. c. iii. § 9. Op. ed. Corder. Venet. 1755. vol. i. p. 194.

[2] Ἱερουργεῖ τὰ θειότατα, καὶ ὑπ' ὄψιν ἄγει τὰ ὑμνημένα διὰ τῶν ἱερῶς προκειμένων συμβόλων· τὸν γὰρ ἐγκεκαλυμμένον καὶ ἀδιαίρετον ἄρτον ἀνακαλύψας, καὶ εἰς πολλὰ διελὼν, καὶ τὸ ἑνιαῖον τοῦ ποτηρίου πᾶσι καταμερίσας, συμβολικῶς τὴν ἑνότητα πληθύνει, καὶ διανέμει, παναγεστάτην ἐν τούτοις ἱερουργίαν τελῶν. ID. ib. § 12. Ib. pp. 196, 197.

[3] Τὰς εἰκόνας and τῶν συμβόλων. ID. ib. § 1. Ib. p. 188.

[4] Εἰκόνας ἐκάλεσε τῶν ἀληθῶν, τὰ νῦν τελούμενα ἐν τῇ συνάξει. MAXIMI Schol. Ib. vol. ii. p. 64.

[5] Ὅτι σύμβολα ταῦτα, καὶ οὐκ ἀλήθεια. ID. ib.

[6] Τῶν ἀγαλμάτων. Ut supra, § 3. p. 189.

"unseen and mystical, that is, those which are celebrated by "signs; and he styled the mystery of the Communion the chief "of these."[1] And Maximus tells us to "observe, that he every-"where calls the divine service of the Communion *symbolical*, and "the holy gifts symbols of things that are *above* and more real."[2]

Thus also Gaudentius, commenting upon a passage which he professes to quote from the Old Testament, and which remarks that both kings and private individuals take the labors of the bee for their health, and comparing our Lord to the bee, observes,—

"For we take for the health of our common life the labors of Christ's Passion..... *in the figure of his body and blood*, and bear witness to the known sweetness of the mysteries with a mouth that has experienced it."[3]

So also Procopius of Gaza, in his Commentary on Genesis (ch. xlix. v. 12), says, that Christ "gave the image of his own body to the disciples."[4]

In very similar language Origen says,—"The bread which is "called the Eucharist is to us a symbol of thanksgiving to "God."[5]

And Ludolf tells us, that in the Æthiopic Church, notwithstanding the words in their Liturgy importing a change in the elements, he was assured on good authority, that the only change they acknowledged was,—

"That the common bread and wine appeared to them to be

[1] Ἀγάλματα μέν φησι τὰς εἰκόνας τῶν ἀοράτων καὶ μυστικῶν, ἤγουν, τὰ συμβολικῶς τελούμενα· πρῶτον δὲ τούτων, τὸ τῆς συνάξεως μυστήριον ἀπεκάλεσεν. Ut supra, p. 65.

[2] Σημείωσαι δὲ, ὅτι πανταχοῦ συμβολικὴν λέγει τὴν θείαν ἱερουργίαν, καὶ τὰ ἅγια δῶρα σύμβολα τῶν ἄνω καὶ ἀληθινωτέρων. Ib. p. 71.

[3] Labores enim Passionis Christi.... in figura corporis ejus ac sanguinis, pro salubritate vitæ communis afferimus, et agnitam dulcedinem mysteriorum conscio ore testamur. GAUDENT. BRIX. Serm. xix. seu De divers. capit. ix. Op. ed. cit. 364.

[4] Παρέδωκε εἰκόνα τοῦ ἰδίου σώματος μαθηταῖς. PROCOP. GAZ. In Gen. xlix. 12. Ex MS. Biblioth. Augustan. apud Coeffeteau Des Noms du Sacrament. See Albert. De Euchar. p. 856.

[5] Ἔστι δὲ καὶ σύμβολον ἡμῖν τῆς πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν εὐχαριστίας, ἄρτος εὐχαριστία καλούμενος. ORIGEN. Contra Cels. lib. viii. § 57. Op. i. 784.

changed into that which had a mystery in it, and was *representative* of the body and blood of Jesus Christ, and so was changed from what was common into that which was sacred, so as to *represent* to the communicants the true body and blood of Christ."[1]

I have here quoted only those passages that have a direct and express reference to the Eucharist. But the reader will bear in mind, that many other extracts have been given from the Fathers in a previous part of this work,[2] showing that they understood the eating Christ's flesh and drinking his blood mentioned in John vi. as spoken in a symbolical sense; and I think that few will deny, that this, though it would not *prove* that they held that his flesh and blood were, so far as regards the oral reception, only symbolically received in the Eucharist *also*, goes very far in that direction. After, however, the direct proof just given, it is only necessary thus briefly to allude to this confirmatory evidence.

It will be observed, that all the passages above quoted speak of the elements in their state *after consecration*, and call them, as they *then* exist, *symbols, figures, antitypes*, &c. They speak of them with reference to their condition as they are *received* by the communicant, as *symbols, figures, antitypes*, &c.

According, then, to the doctrine of the Fathers above quoted, *the consecrated sacramental substances* are *in themselves* only *figures, signs*, and *symbols* of the real body and blood of Christ; though effectual, in the case of all worthy recipients, for bringing them into communion with those things which they represent. And we must ever remember the distinction between the sacrament as meaning the sacramental elements, and the sacrament as meaning the sacramental rite. The former consists of a sign or symbol only; the latter, in the case of all worthy recipients, consists of the sign and the thing signified together, both being given in it. The grace of a sacrament forms part of *the sacramental rite* in the case of all worthy recipients, but no part of

[1] Sibi videri panem et vinum vulgare converti in mysteriosum et repræsentativum corporis et sanguinis Jesu Christi, adeoque e profano in sacrum mutari, ut verum corpus et sanguinem Christi communicantibus repræsentet. LUDOLFI Hist. Æthiop. lib. iii. c. 5. § 55. Francof. 1681. fol.

[2] See pp. 107—118, above.

*the sacramental elements* in any case. And by keeping in view this distinction, we shall be able to detect much of the sophistry of Archdeacon Wilberforce's book, which is founded upon a slippery use of the words Eucharist and Sacrament in different senses, even when applied to the same thing.

These terms, therefore, being constantly used by the Fathers with reference to the *consecrated elements*,—not merely the *bread* and *wine*, but the *sacramental substances as they exist after consecration*,—it follows, that they could not hold, that those substances *were*, or *consisted partly of*, the real body and blood of Christ. For it is impossible that those who hold the doctrine either of Transubstantiation or Consubstantiation, can with any propriety apply such terms to the *whole sacramental substances as they exist after consecration*. Both indeed seem to admit this. For the Romanists say, that the words *type*, *figure*, *sign*, &c. apply only to the remaining *accidents of the bread and wine*, which they think form the representative part of the sacrament, or the symbols of our Lord's body and blood. And those who hold consubstantiation, hold that these words apply to the bread and wine; which, they contend, remain in their natural state, as PORTIONS of *the consecrated sacramental substances*. But neither one nor the other of these can apply the words, as the Fathers do, to THE WHOLE *consecrated sacramental substances*. Here, therefore, whatever they may say of those passages of the Fathers in which the sacramental substances are called the Body and Blood of Christ, they are clearly and incontestably opposed to the statements of the Fathers. We, on the contrary, while we find no difficulty in receiving the former passages, understanding the phrases used in the sense in which they ought to be understood, namely, as *sacramental phrases*, find our doctrine very clearly maintained in the latter statements.

Archdeacon Wilberforce urges,[1] that bread and wine are not suitable things to represent Christ's body and blood. It is unnecessary for me to argue against such a notion, though I think it would be easy to show that it is remarkably groundless. The point with which we are now concerned is the testimony of An-

[1] pp. 113, 114, or 3rd ed. pp. 96, 97.

tiquity whether they are so applied, and I think the passages just quoted pretty clearly prove the affirmative. But, in fact, we may go beyond this. For instance, Isidore of Seville, as we have seen,[1] points out their peculiar fitness for the purpose, remarking,—"Bread, inasmuch as it strengthens the body, is therefore called the body of Christ; but wine, inasmuch as it produces blood in the flesh, is therefore referred to the blood of Christ." And other passages of a similar kind might, if necessary, be added. But I think there is so little chance that the Archdeacon will get many to view this point in the same light with himself, that I do not think it worth further consideration.

I shall only add on this head, that we are not without direct Patristical testimony for the soundness of the conclusion we have drawn from the passages of the Fathers just quoted.

It was admitted by John Damascene, one of the earliest of those who advocated a real objective presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in or under the Bread and Wine,[2] that the application of the terms *figure*, *type*, &c. to the *consecrated elements* is inconsistent with the notion of a real presence of Christ's body and blood in them. For, contending for a real objective presence, he says, "The bread and wine is not a type "of the body and blood of Christ; by no means . . . . . and "if some have called the bread and wine antitypes of the body

[1] See p. 242 above.

[2] His notion appears to have been, that by the action of the Holy Spirit upon the elements, they were changed so as to become a portion of the Body and Blood of our Lord. According to this notion, we should not partake of the Body and Blood born of the Virgin, but of something added to that Body and Blood by the Holy Spirit at the time of our communicating. Archdeacon Wilberforce, perceiving that this is the natural inference from his words, very characteristically endeavours to turn aside the difficulty by saying that this would be the case if "this change were conformable to the ordinary order of things." (pp. 278, 279. 3rd ed. p. 238.) Of course such statements cannot be reached by argument. They amount simply to an assertion that all reasoning is useless, and every objection to be silenced by the declaration that the change is not of an ordinary kind. And it is observable, that the Archdeacon is obliged to admit, that "in a work which, though the composition apparently of an imitator of Damascene, has yet sufficient resemblance to his style to have been attributed formerly to himself," and which is placed among his works, the very phrase is used with reference to the consecrated bread, *εἰς ἐπαύξησιν τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ*. (Epis. ad Zach. Episc. Doar. In Damasc. vol. i. p. 656.)

"and blood of the Lord, as the divine Basil spoke,[1] they have "not said this of them after consecration, but *before consecra-* "*tion*,[2] so calling the oblation."[3]

In this remark, however, the passages just quoted show that he was altogether mistaken.

And so in the second Council of Nice, an extract having been read from the proscribed Council of Constantinople, arguing against images, and urging that our Lord had appointed bread as *the image of his Body*, "not shaped after the figure of a man, lest idolatry should be introduced,"[4] it was replied in the Answer drawn up by some members of the Council, and read in it, that none of the Apostles or Fathers had ever called the unbloody sacrifice "an image of his body;"[5] that indeed "before the completion of the consecration some of the holy Fathers had

[1] Probably alluding to his Liturgy.

[2] In all the Greek and Oriental Liturgies, so far as I can find, the offering of the elements takes place *before* their complete consecration and supposed change by the descent of the Holy Spirit upon them, as there invoked. I have not, therefore, quoted above those passages in which the elements *as offered* are spoken of by the Greek Fathers as symbols and antitypes (as for instance MACARIUS, Hom. 27. § 17. Op. ed. Prit. Lips. 1714. p. 386. THEODORET, Interpr. in Psalm. 109. v. 4. Op. ed. cit. i. 1397, and the AUTHOR OF THE APOSTOLICAL CONSTITUTIONS, lib. vi. c. 23. Inter Patr. Apost. ed. Coteler. Amstel. 1724. tom. i. p. 356.), because such passages would not *prove*, that they would use the same terms to them after their consecration was completed. And here I must notice, in passing, though I shall have to advert to it more fully hereafter, the remarkable and palpable mistake of Archdeacon Wilberforce in arguing as he does at great length in his 11th chapter, that the "ancient Church supposed the offering presented in the Holy Eucharist to consist not of the *sacramentum* only, but of the *res sacramenti* also." (p. 389, or, 3rd ed. p. 335.) How, in the face of a host of Greek and Oriental Liturgies, in all which the invocation of the Holy Spirit to descend and make the bread and wine to become the Body and Blood of Christ *comes after* the solemn offering up of the elements to God, (as alluded to in the above passage of John Damascene,) he could venture upon such a course of argument, and without touching this difficulty, it is not easy to comprehend.

[3] Οὐκ ἔστι τύπος ὁ ἄρτος καὶ ὁ οἶνος τοῦ σώματος καὶ αἵματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ· μὴ γένοιτο.... Εἰ δὲ καὶ τινες ἀντίτυπα τοῦ σώματος καὶ αἵματος τοῦ Κυρίου τὸν ἄρτον καὶ τὸν οἶνον ἐκάλεσαν, ὡς ὁ θεοφόρος ἔφη Βασίλειος, οὐ μετὰ τὸ ἁγιασθῆναι εἶπον, ἀλλὰ πρὶν ἁγιασθῆναι, αὐτὴν τὴν προσφορὰν οὕτω καλέσαντες. JOANN. DAMASC. De fide orthod. lib. iv. c. 13. Op. ed. Le Quien. Venet. 1748. tom. i. pp. 271, 273.

[4] Τὴν εἰκόνα, ὕλην ἐξαίρετον, ἤγουν ἄρτου οὐσίαν προσέταξεν προσφέρεσθαι, μὴ σχηματίζουσαν ἀνθρώπου μορφὴν, ἵνα μὴ εἰδωλολατρεία παρεισαχθῇ.... ὁ θεοπαράδοτος εἰκὼν τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ ὁ θεῖος ἄρτος. Concil. Nic. secund. Inter Concil. ed. Hardouin. Paris. 1714. tom. iv. col. 368, 369. It is right to add, that the writers seemed nevertheless to consider the bread and wine to receive the influences of the Holy Spirit to fit them for their purpose.

[5] Οὐδεὶς κ. τ. λ.. ..τὴν ἀναίμακτον ἡμῶν θυσίαν.... εἶπεν εἰκόνα τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ. Ib. col. 369.

piously thought good to call the elements antitypes;"[1] and it instances Eustathius[2] and Basil; but that "after the consecration they are called, and are, and are believed to be, the Body and Blood of Christ really;"[3] and to call them *an image*, it pronounces to be madness and impiety, for "if it is an image of the Body, it cannot be the divine Body itself."[4]

It is admitted, therefore, by these Fathers, that to call the consecrated Eucharistic substances *types* or *images*, is inconsistent with a notion of the real presence of our Lord's Body and Blood in or under them; and consequently we have their testimony in favor of the conclusion we have drawn from passages in which such a phrase is used.

(11.) *The Fathers tell us, that in the Eucharist the Body of Christ is present as* DEAD, *and his Blood as* SHED, *upon the Cross, and that we eat and drink them* AS SUCH; *and they cannot be really and substantially present in this form, as they do not now exist in it.*

If the doctrine of the Authors under review is correct, the Body of our Lord must be present in the Eucharist as *now* living and glorified. But the Fathers represent the body eaten in the Eucharist as the body of Christ in a state of death.

Thus, Augustine says,—

"We are fed from the cross of the Lord, because we eat his body."[5]

And again,—

"The Passion of Christ is a table of joyfulness, who offered himself for us on the table of the cross a sacrifice to God the Father, giving to his Catholic Church a life-giving feast, to wit satiating us with his body and inebriating us with his blood. The Church fed

[1] Πρὸ μὲν τῆς τοῦ ἁγιασμοῦ τελειώσεως, ἀντίτυπά τισι τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων εὐσεβῶς ἔδοξεν ὀνομάζεσθαι. ID. ib.

[2] The passage which it gives from Eustathius certainly goes against it, and is a testimony for what we are here contending for. It is an interpretation of the passage in the Book of Proverbs, "Eat of my bread and drink of the wine which I have mingled," and is this: "By the wine and bread he proclaims the antitypes of the bodily members of Christ." (Διὰ τοῦ οἴνου καὶ τοῦ ἄρτου τὰ ἀντίτυπα τῶν σωματικῶν τοῦ Χριστοῦ κηρύττει μελῶν.) But the things *received by the communicant* are the *consecrated elements*.

[3] Μετὰ δὲ τὸν ἁγιασμὸν σῶμα κυρίως καὶ αἷμα Χριστοῦ λέγονται, καὶ εἰσι, καὶ πιστεύονται. ID. ib. col. 372.

[4] Εἰ εἰκὼν τοῦ σώματός ἐστιν, οὐκ ἐνδέχεται εἶναι αὐτὸ τὸ θεῖον σῶμα. ID. ib.

[5] Nos de cruce Domini pascimur, quia corpus ipsius manducamus. AUGUST. In Ps. 100. Op. iv. 817.

and vivified *from this table*, triumphs over those that afflict her, having the hope of eternal life through her life the Lord Christ, who hath abundantly anointed her with the oil of gladness through the Holy Spirit. On account of this table the Apostle rebuked the idolatrous Corinthians, saying, 'Ye cannot hold communion with the table of the Lord and the table of devils,' " &c.[1]

It is on Christ as lying on the table of the cross, crucified and sacrificed, that the Church feeds. And hence he says elsewhere, comparing the nations to the dogs that licked the sores of Lazarus, that the nations "now throughout the whole world lick the passion of our Lord in the sacraments of his body and blood with the most devout suavity."[2]

To the same effect Cyprian says, that, "as we cannot come "to drink wine, unless the bunch of grapes is previously "trodden and pressed, so neither could we drink the blood of "Christ, unless Christ was previously trodden and pressed."[3]

The view here inculcated is precisely the same. It is the blood of Christ as proceeding from his side on the cross that we are to drink.

And Gregory Nyssen still more clearly expresses the same view, when, speaking of the Eucharist, he says,—"For the body of the victim would not be fit for eating, if it was living;"[4] and therefore he holds, that in our Lord's last Supper with his disciples, when he said, "Take, eat, this is my body," the sacrifice of his body was to be considered as in effect made, and the elements were to be taken as his crucified body and shed blood.

[1] Mensa jocunditatis Passio Christi est, qui se pro nobis in mensa crucis obtulit sacrificium Deo Patri, donans Ecclesiæ suæ catholicæ vitale convivium, corpore suo nos videlicet satians et inebrians sanguine. Hac mensa pasta et vivificata, adversus eos qui tribulant eam exsultat Ecclesia, habens spem vitæ æternæ per suam vitam Dominum Christum, qui eam oleo lætitiæ per Sanctum Spiritum unxit abunde. Propter hanc mensam corripiebat in idolio recumbentes Corinthios Apostolus dicens, Non potestis communicare mensæ Domini et mensæ dæmoniorum, &c. Id. Serm. 366. § 6. Op. v. 1013.

[2] Passiones Domini in sacramentis corporis et sanguinis ejus per totum jam orbem suavitate lambunt devotissima. Id. Quæst. Evang. lib. ii. q. 38. Op. iii. pt. 2. col. 192.

[3] Quo modo ad potandum vinum veniri non potest, nisi botrus calcetur ante, et prematur; sic nec nos sanguinem Christi possemus bibere, nisi Christus calcatus prius fuisset et pressus. Cypr. Epist. ad Cæcil. ep. 63. Op. ed. cit. pt. 2. p. 150.

[4] Οὐ γὰρ ἂν ἦν τὸ σῶμα τοῦ ἱερείου πρὸς ἐδωδὴν ἐπιτήδειον, εἴπερ ἔμψυχον ἦν. Gregor. Nyss. In Christi resurr. orat. 1. Op. ed. Paris. 1615. tom. ii. p. 821.

And Chrysostom everywhere speaks of our Lord's body lying on the table as slain and sacrificed.

Thus he says,—

"He hath granted to us to be filled with his holy flesh; he hath placed himself before us sacrificed."[1]

So again in the following passage, the latter part of which has been already quoted:—

"When the heretics say, Whence is it manifest that Christ was sacrificed, we, together with other arguments, stop their mouths from the mysteries; for if Jesus did not die, of what are the consecrated elements the symbols?"[2]

He clearly means that they represent his broken body and shed blood.

So elsewhere he says,—"Christ lies before us slain;"[3] and speaking of the holy table, he describes it as "Where Christ lies sacrificed;"[4] and upon that table he represents us as seeing him who was crucified as "a lamb slain and sacrificed."[5] Nay, he tells us, that "Christ's blood is emptied into the cup from his immaculate side."[6] And he speaks of our seeing in the Eucharistic rite "the Lord sacrificed and lying," and "all [the communicants] red with that precious blood."[7]

All these passages clearly express a very different notion from that of those who suppose a presence in the elements of our blessed Lord's present living and glorified body, and as clearly refer to the body as crucified and the blood as shed upon the cross, and therefore can only be understood,—as all must admit the phrase as to the people being "red with the blood of

[1] Τῶν ἁγίων σαρκῶν αὐτοῦ ἐμπλησθῆναι ἔδωκεν ἡμῖν, ἑαυτὸν παρέθηκε τεθυμένον. Chrysost. In Matth. hom. 50. § 3. Op. vii. 517.

[2] "Οταν γὰρ λέγωσι, πόθεν δῆλον ὅτι ἐτύθη ὁ Χριστός; μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν μυστηρίων αὐτοὺς ἐπιστομίζομεν· εἰ γὰρ μὴ ἀπέθανεν ὁ Ιησοῦς, τίνος σύμβολα τὰ τελούμενα; Id. ib. hom. 82. § 1. Op. vii. 783.

[3] Ἐσφαγμένος πρόκειται ὁ Χριστός. Id. De prod. Judæ, hom. 1. § 6, and hom. 2. § 6. Op. ii. 384 and 394.

[4] Ἐπὶ τραπέζης ὁρκίζεις ἱερᾶς, καὶ ἔνθα ὁ Χριστὸς κεῖται τεθυμένος, ἐκεῖ τὸν ἀδελφὸν καταθύεις τὸν σόν; Id. Ad popul. Antioch. hom. 15. § 5. Op. ii. 158.

[5] Ὡς ἀμνὸν ἐσφαγμένον καὶ τεθυμένον. Id. De Cæmet. § 3. Op. ii. 401.

[6] Τοῦ αἵματος ἐν τῷ κρατῆρι εἰς σὴν κάθαρσιν ἐκ τῆς ἀχράντου πλευρᾶς κενουμένου. Id. De pœnit. hom. 9. Op. ii. 349.

[7] "Οταν γὰρ ἴδῃς τὸν Κύριον τεθυμένον, καὶ κείμενον.... καὶ πάντας ἐκείνῳ τῷ τιμίῳ φοινισσομένους αἵματι, κ. τ. λ. Id. De sacerd. lib. iii. § 4. Op. i. 382.

Christ" is to be understood, namely,—figuratively and symbolically.

(12.) *The reasons given by the Fathers for mixing water with the wine in the Eucharist still further show their views with respect to the nature of the rite.*

The general practice in the early Church was to mix water with the wine used in the Eucharist; and for this usage, besides the supposition that our Lord did so, two special reasons were assigned. One was, that there might be a distinct representation of the water that flowed from our Blessed Lord's side with the blood on the cross; the other was, that the Christian people, the mystical body of Christ, might be represented in the elements as well as Christ's natural body and blood.

The former reason is assigned by, among others, Pope Alexander (according to Gratian), Gennadius, the author of the work "De Sacramentis," ascribed to Ambrose, and a canon in the Quinisext Council or Council *in Trullo*, and one in the collection of Martinus Bracarensis.

Thus Pope Alexander (according to Gratian) says,—

"For, (as we have received from the Fathers, and reason itself teaches) in the cup of the Lord, neither wine alone nor water alone ought to be offered, but both mixed together; because we read that both flowed from his side in his Passion." [1]

And Gennadius,—

"In the Eucharist we ought not to offer pure water, as some do, deceived by its appearance of sobriety, but wine mixed with water: inasmuch as there was wine in the mystery (or, sacrament) of our redemption, when he said, 'I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine;' and what was given after supper, was mixed with water. And moreover the water coming out with the blood from his side, which was pierced with a lance, showed the wine from the true vine of his flesh poured out with water." [2]

[1] Non enim debet (ut a patribus accepimus, et ipsa ratio docet) in calice Domini aut vinum solum aut aqua sola offerri, sed utrumque permistum: quia utrumque ex latere ejus in passione sua profluxisse legitur. ALEXANDER PAPA in Gratiani Decret. Pt. 3. dist. 2. c. 1. Corp. Jur. Canon. Lugd. 1624. vol. i. col. 1911, 1912.

[2] In Eucharistia non debet pura aqua offerri, ut quidam sobrietatis falluntur imagine; sed vinum cum aqua mixtum: quia et vinum fuit in redemptionis nostræ mysterio, cum dixit, "Non bibam a modo de hoc genimine vitis;" et aqua mixtum quod post cœnam dabatur. Sed et de latere ejus, quod lancea perfossum

The author of the work "De Sacramentis," attributed to Ambrose, also gives as a reason for mixing water with the wine, that water flowed with the blood from our Lord's pierced side; adding, however, another reason, derived from the water which flowed from the smitten rock in the wilderness.[1]

And in one of the Canons of the Quinisext Council, or Council *in Trullo*, this is authoritatively laid down as the reason for mixing water with the wine. Blaming the Armenians for not mixing water with the wine, and endeavouring to show that their practice in this respect proceeded from a misapprehension of some words of Chrysostom, the Council says, that Chrysostom, "in his own Church, where he exercised his pastoral superin-
"tendence, directed that water should be mingled with the
"wine, when the unbloody sacrifice was to be performed; show-
"ing the mixture of blood and water that came from the
"precious side of our Redeemer and Saviour Christ our God."[2]

The Canon in the Collection of Martinus Bracarensis runs as follows,—

"It is not right that anything else should be offered in the sacrament except bread, wine, and water, which are blessed for a type of Christ; because, when he hung upon the cross, from his body flowed blood and water."[3]

And this is the generally received view of the Greek Church,[4] in which, in order to keep up the representation more perfectly, the water is used warm; and Balsamon blames the Church of

est, aqua cum sanguine egressa, vinum de vera ejus carnis vite cum aqua expressum ostendit. GENNAD. De eccles. dogm. c. 42. (al. 75.) Inter Op. August. ed. cit. viii. App. 75.

[1] PSEUD-AMBROS. De sacramentis, lib. v. c. 1. Inter AMBROSII Op. ed. cit. ii. 373, 374.

[2] Ἐπεὶ καὶ τῇ κατ' αὐτὸν ἐκκλησίᾳ ἔνθα τὴν ποιμαντικὴν ἐνεχειρίσθη ἡγεμονίαν, ὕδωρ οἴνῳ μίγνυσθαι παρέδωκεν, ἡνίκα τὴν ἀναίμακτον θυσίαν ἐπιτελεῖσθαι δεήσειεν, τὴν ἐκ τῆς τιμίας πλευρᾶς τοῦ λυτρωτοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος Χριστοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐξ αἵματος καὶ ὕδατος κρᾶσιν παραδεικνύς. CONCIL. QUINISEXT. sive in Trullo, can. 32. Concil. ed. Hardouin. iii. 1673.

[3] Non oportet aliquid aliud in sacramento offerri, præter panem vinum et aquam, quæ in typo Christi benedicuntur; quia, dum in cruce penderet, de corpore ejus sanguis effluxit et aqua. MARTINI BRACAR. Collect. Can. c. 55. Inter Gratiani Decret. Pt. 3. dist. 2. c. 4. Corp. Jur. Canon. ed. cit. tom. i. col. 1913.

[4] See the Πηδάλιον, published at Athens in 1841. 4to. p. 141. *note*.

Rome for using *cold* water, as not properly representing that which flowed from our Saviour's side.

Now nothing can more fully show, that the doctrine of the early Church was, that what was partaken of in the Eucharist, was to be (that is, symbolically, for it could be so no otherwise) *that which suffered on the cross.* It was to be the body that hung *dead upon the cross,* the blood *there shed,* and the water which *there flowed from our Lord's side.*

I might press this argument further, particularly against the Romanists; for I would ask them,—Supposing the wine to be transubstantiated into our Blessed Lord's blood, what becomes of the water they use with the wine to represent the water that flowed with the blood from our Lord's side? For *they* also, as the Council of Trent tells us, use the water with this signification, as being an antient practice. If the *mixture* of the wine and water is transubstantiated into the blood, then nothing is partaken of by the communicant in remembrance of the water. The only way in which the practice of mixing water with the wine can be of any use to the communicant is by his partaking of the wine and water as symbolically representing the blood and water that flowed together from our Lord's side.

And of those who hold the doctrine of Consubstantiation I would ask,—Supposing the blood to be present in or under the wine, how the water that flowed from our Lord's side on the cross can be present in or under the water mixed with the wine? And yet if their view is correct, this ought to be the case. They will not allow that a symbolical representation of the blood can be of any use, and therefore in common consistency they must hold the same notion with respect to the water.

But by some of the Fathers the other reason was assigned for this practice, namely, that *the Christian people* might be represented in what was received by the communicants. This is the reason insisted on by Cyprian in a passage well worth our attention in connexion with the dotrine under especial consideration in this work. After referring to Rev. xvii. 15, as showing that waters are a symbol used in Scripture for people, he adds,—

"Which in truth we see to be contained in the sacrament of the cup. For inasmuch as Christ, who also bare our sins, bare us all, we see that in the water the people are understood, and in the wine

is shown the blood of Christ. But when the wine is mixed with water in the cup, the people are united to Christ, and the multitude of believers is connected and conjoined with him in whom they have believed. Which commixture and conjunction of the water and wine is so mingled together in the Lord's cup, that that commixture cannot be separated into its component parts . . . . Thus in sanctifying the Lord's cup, water cannot be offered alone, as neither can wine be offered alone; for if any one offers wine only, the blood of Christ begins to be without us; but, if water should be offered alone, the people begin to be without Christ; but when both are mixed together, and coupled with one another by mutual union and commixture, then a spiritual and heavenly sacrament is perfected. But as the Lord's cup is not water alone, or wine alone, but only a commixture of both, so neither can the Lord's body be meal alone, or water alone, but a union and mixture of both, compacted together into one loaf. By which very sacrament also our people is shown to be united, that, as many grains collected together into one mass, and ground together, and mixed up, make one loaf, thus in Christ, who is the heavenly bread, we may know that we are one body, to which the multitude of our people is conjoined and united." [2]

Now it is clear, that, according to the views of the author of this passage, just as *the water* becomes, when used in the sacrament, *the Christian people*, so and no otherwise *the wine* becomes *the blood of Christ*. Whether the reason assigned for the use of the water is a fanciful one or not, is not material to our argument. I quote the passage merely as showing the views of the

[1] Quod scilicet perspicimus et in sacramento calicis contineri. Nam quia nos omnes portabat Christus, qui et peccata nostra portabat; videmus in aqua populum intelligi, in vino vero ostendi sanguinem Christi. Quando autem in calice vino aqua miscetur, Christo populus adunatur, et credentium plebs ei in quem credidit, copulatur et conjungitur. Quæ copulatio et conjunctio aquæ et vini sic miscetur in calice Domini, ut commixtio illa non possit ab invicem separari . . . . Sic autem in sanctificando calice Domini, offerri aqua sola non potest, quomodo nec vinum solum potest; nam si vinum tantum quis offerat, sanguis Christi incipit esse sine nobis; si vero aqua sit sola, plebs incipit esse sine Christo; quando autem utrumque miscetur, et adunatione confusa sibi invicem copulatur, tunc sacramentum spiritale et cœleste perficitur. Sic vero calix Domini non est aqua sola, aut vinum solum, nisi utrumque sibi misceatur, quomodo nec corpus Domini potest esse farina sola, aut aqua sola, nisi utrumque adunatum fuerit et copulatum, et panis unius compage solidatum. Quo et ipso sacramento populus noster ostenditur adunatus, ut quemadmodum grana multa in unum collecta et commolita et commixta panem unum faciunt; sic in Christo qui est panis cœlestis, unum sciamus esse corpus, cui conjunctus sit noster numerus et adunatus. CYPRIAN. Epist. ad Cæcil. ep. 63. Op. ed. cit. Pt. 2. pp. 153, 154.

writer as to the way in which, and in which alone, the elements become the body and blood of Christ.

The very same expressions are also used by Pope Julius, in a letter to the Bishops in Egypt, giving directions on the subject of the Eucharist, as reported by Gratian.[1]

(13.) *It was the opinion of the Fathers, that the Body of Christ in the Eucharist is a sacrament not only of that body that hung upon the cross, but of that mystical body of Christ that consists of all true believers; and they speak of the latter* BEING RECEIVED *in the Eucharist just as they do of the former; and therefore only in a figurative sense of both.*

The passage just quoted from Cyprian shows of what importance he considered it to be, that there should be a representation of the Christian people, the mystical body of Christ, in what was received by the communicants in the Eucharist. And this passage is quoted with approbation from Cyprian by Isidore of Seville in his work on *the Offices of the Church.*[2]

And it would be easy to add other passages from the Fathers, referring to the mystical body of Christ as that which we receive in the Eucharist.

This appears to be meant by Theodotus, (who, though a Valentinian, may be heard on this point) when he says,—explaining the words, "The bread which I will give is my flesh,"—"Either "that with which the flesh is nourished through the Eucharist, "or, which is preferable, the flesh is his body, which is the "Church, the heavenly bread, the blessed assembly."[3]

The language of Chrysostom is very similar in his Commentary on 1 Cor. x. 17,—"For we being many are one bread and one body;" on which he remarks,—

"Why do I speak of communion, says the Apostle? *We are that very body itself.* For what is the bread? The body of Christ. And what do the communicants become? The body of Christ; not many bodies, but one body. For as the bread (or, loaf) is one whole, composed of many grains, so that the grains by no means

[1] GRATIANI Decretum, Pt. 3. dist. 2. c. 7. Corp. Jur. Canon. ed. cit. tom. i. col. 1915.

[2] De Eccles. Offic. lib. i. c. 18. Op. tom. vi. col. 384.

[3] Ἤτοι ᾧ τρέφεται ἡ σὰρξ διὰ τῆς εὐχαριστίας· ἢ, ὅπερ καὶ μᾶλλον, ἡ σὰρξ τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ ἐστιν, ὅπέρ ἐστιν ἡ Ἐκκλησία, ἄρτος οὐράνιος, συναγωγὴ εὐλογημένη. THEODOTI Excerpt. ad fin. Clem. Alex. Op. ed. cit. tom. ii. p. 971.

appear, but nevertheless exist, but their distinction from one another is not apparent on account of their conjunction, so also we are conjoined *with one another and with Christ.*" [1]

But the language to which I am more particularly referring in this place is such as that used by Augustine in the following passages, where we shall see that he speaks of our receiving in the Eucharist that body of Christ which consists of the company of true believers, just in the same terms in which we find the Fathers speaking of our receiving in the Eucharist that body of Christ that hung upon the cross. The first I shall quote occurs in a short sermon, addressed to the young, on the Sacrament, which has been preserved to us by Fulgentius; and as the force of the passage is much increased by viewing it in connexion with the context, I shall give it at length:—

"That which ye see on the altar of God, ye saw also last night; but what it is, what it means, of how great a thing it contains a sacrament, ye have not yet heard. That therefore which ye see is bread and a cup; as even your eyes tell you; but what your faith needs to be instructed in is, the bread is the body of Christ, the cup is the blood of Christ. This indeed is said in few words, which perhaps may be sufficient for faith; but faith requires instruction. . . . . For a thought of this kind may arise in the mind of any one; we know whence our Lord Jesus Christ took his flesh; from the Virgin Mary. He was nursed at the breast and nourished as an infant, he grew, he arrived at the age of youth, he suffered persecution from the Jews, was hung upon a cross, was slain on a cross, was taken down from the cross, was buried, rose the third day, the day he chose, ascended into heaven; *took up his body thither;* shall come from thence to judge the quick and the dead; is there now sitting at the right hand of the Father: how is the bread his body? and the cup, or what the cup contains, how is it his blood? *Those things, brethren, are therefore called sacraments, because one thing is seen in them, another is understood.* That which is seen has a bodily form; that which is understood has spiritual fruit. *If therefore you wish to understand the body of Christ, hear the Apostle saying to the faithful,* '*Ye are the body of Christ, and his*

[1] Τί γὰρ λέγω κοινωνίαν, φησίν; αὐτό ἐσμεν ἐκεῖνο τὸ σῶμα· τί γὰρ ἐστιν ὁ ἄρτος; σῶμα Χριστοῦ. τί δὲ γίνονται οἱ μεταλαμβάνοντες; σῶμα Χριστοῦ. οὐχὶ σώματα πολλὰ, ἀλλὰ σῶμα ἕν. καθάπερ γὰρ ὁ ἄρτος ἐκ πολλῶν συγκείμενος κόκκων ἥνωται, ὡς μηδαμοῦ φαίνεσθαι τοὺς κόκκους, ἀλλ' εἶναι μὲν αὐτοὺς, ἄδηλον δὲ αὐτῶν εἶναι τὴν διαφορὰν τῇ συναφείᾳ, οὕτω καὶ ἀλλήλοις καὶ τῷ Χριστῷ συναπτόμεθα. Chrysost. Comment. in 1 Cor. (x. 17.) hom. 24. § 2. Op. x. 213.

*members.' If therefore ye are the body of Christ and his members, the sacrament (mystery) of yourselves is placed upon the Lord's table; ye receive the sacrament (mystery) of yourselves. To that which ye* ARE, *ye answer Amen, and by answering subscribe to it.* For you hear, 'The body of Christ;' and you answer, Amen. Be a member of Christ's body, that your Amen may be true.[1] Why therefore in the bread? Let us here say nothing of our own, let us constantly hear the Apostle himself, who, when he was speaking of that sacrament, says, 'We being many are one bread and one body;' understand and be joyful; unity, truth, piety, charity. 'One bread.' What is that one bread? 'We being many are one body.' Recollect that bread is not made of one grain, but of many. When ye were exorcised, ye were, as it were, ground. When ye were baptized, ye were, as it were, sprinkled with water. When ye received the fire of the Holy Spirit, ye were, as it were, baked. BE WHAT YE SEE, AND TAKE WHAT YE ARE.[2] This the Apostle spoke concerning the bread. And now what we are to understand respecting the cup is evident without further remark. For as, in order that there may be the visible form of bread, many grains are moistened into one mass, as that happens which the Holy Scripture says of the faithful, 'There was in them one soul and one heart towards God' [Acts iv. 32]; so also with respect to the wine. Brethren, recollect whence wine comes. Many separate grapes hang upon a bunch, but the juice of them is mingled together into one. So also hath the Lord Christ represented us, wished us to belong to himself, consecrated upon his table the sacrament (mystery) of peace and our unity.[3] He who receives the sacrament (mystery) of unity, and does not hold the bond of peace, does not receive the sacrament (mystery) in favor of himself, but as a testimony against himself."[4]

[1] Ista, fratres, ideo dicuntur sacramenta, quia in eis aliud videtur, aliud intelligitur. Quod videtur speciem habet corporalem, quod intelligitur fructum habet spiritalem. Corpus ergo Christi si vis intelligere, Apostolum audi dicentem fidelibus, 'Vos autem estis corpus Christi et membra.' Si ergo vos estis corpus Christi et membra, mysterium vestrum in mensa Dominica positum est: mysterium vestrum accipitis. Ad id quod estis, Amen respondetis, et respondendo subscribitis. Audis enim, Corpus Christi, et respondes, Amen. Esto membrum corporis Christi, ut verum sit Amen.

[2] Estote quod videtis, et accipite quod estis.

[3] Ita et Dominus Christus nos significavit, nos ad se pertinere voluit, mysterium pacis et unitatis nostræ in sua mensa consecravit.

[4] AUGUSTINI Serm. 272. Op. v. 769, 770. Also, inter Op. Fulgentii ad fin Epist. 12.

The same language he frequently repeats elsewhere. For instance, in another sermon he speaks thus,—

"Inasmuch as he suffered for us, he commended to us in that sacrament his body and blood; which also he made us ourselves to be. For we also are made his body, and by his mercy *we are what we receive*. . . . Ye are now come in the name of Christ as to the cup of the Lord; and there *ye are on the table*, and there *ye are in the cup*. Ye are with us. For we take this together, we drink together, because we live together." [1]

And again in his Treatise on the City of God he says,—

"This is the sacrifice of Christians: 'we being many are one body in Christ.' And this the Church frequently solemnizes in the sacrament of the altar known to the faithful, where it is shown her, that *she herself is offered in that thing which she offers*." [2]

Augustine therefore tells us, that the company of true Christians "are on the table," "are in the cup," in the Eucharist, and are "received" there by the communicants; just as our Lord's body is said to be "on the table," and his blood "in the cup," and he himself "received" by us.

But in what sense alone the company of the faithful can be on the table and in the cup, and received by us in the Eucharist, I need not, I suppose, stop to point out.

A still more remarkable passage perhaps, as illustrative of this point, is that where, commenting on the passage, "he that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life," he says, "By this meat and drink he wishes to be understood *the society of his body and members*, which is *the holy Church*;" adding immediately after,—"The sacrament of *this thing*, that is, of *the unity of the body and blood of Christ*, is prepared on the

[1] Quia passus est pro nobis, commendavit nobis in isto sacramento corpus et sanguinem suum; quod etiam fecit et nos ipsos. Nam et nos corpus ipsius facti sumus, et per misericordiam ipsius quod accipimus, nos sumus. . . . Jam in nomine Christi tamquam ad calicem Domini venistis: et ibi vos estis in mensa, et ibi vos estis in calice. Nobiscum vos estis. Simul enim hoc sumimus, simul bibimus; quia simul vivimus. Id. Serm. 229. Op. v. 680. See also Serm. 57. § 7. Op. v. 233.

[2] Hoc est sacrificium Christianorum: 'multi unum corpus in Christo.' Quod etiam sacramento altaris fidelibus noto frequentat Ecclesia, ut [ubi, ed. Ben. Par. 1685.] ei demonstratur, quod in ea re quam offert, ipsa offeratur. Id. De Civ. Dei. lib. x. c. 6. Op. vii. 186.

Lord's table in some places daily, in others at certain intervals; and is taken from the Lord's table by some unto life, by some unto death; but the thing itself of which it is a sacrament [that is, as previously stated, "*the unity of the body and blood of Christ,*"] is to every man unto life, to none unto death, whoever shall be a partaker of it."[1]

Here it is clear, that the bread and wine are considered as *a sacrament of,* or as *representing, the unity of Christ's mystical body, the Church;* and while some partake of the sacrament only, and therefore partake unto death, others are made partakers of that which the sacrament represents, and admitted into the unity of Christ's mystical body through the operation of the Holy Spirit.

The first Sermon of Augustine which I have just quoted, is, as I have said, preserved to us by Fulgentius in one of his letters, where, opposing the notion that a participation of the Eucharist is absolutely essential to salvation, he quotes this sermon as supporting his argument; maintaining, that, as believers are made members of Christ by baptism, they *are* by baptism what they receive in the Eucharist, and therefore that it cannot be essential to their salvation to receive the Eucharist. His words are these:—

"No one of the faithful ought to be anxious respecting those who although they are rightly baptized, in a sound state of mind, yet, through death taking them off suddenly, are not permitted to eat the flesh of the Lord and drink his blood; on account namely of that saying of the Saviour in which he said, 'Unless ye eat the flesh of the Son of man,' &c. For whoever will consider this not merely according to the mysteries of the truth, but according to the truth of the mystery,[2] will see at once, that this took place in the very laver of holy regeneration. For what is done in the sacrament of holy baptism, but that believers are made members of our Lord

[1] Hunc itaque cibum et potum societatem vult intelligi corporis et membrorum suorum, quod est sancta Ecclesia. . . . Hujus rei sacramentum, id est, unitatis corporis et sanguinis Christi alicubi quotidie, alicubi certis intervallis dierum in Dominica mensa præparatur; et de mensa Dominica sumitur; quibusdam ad vitam, quibusdam ad exitium: res vero ipsa cujus sacramentum est, omni homini ad vitam, nulli ad exitium, quicumque ejus particeps fuerit. Id. In Johann. tract. 26. § 15. Op. iii. pt. 2. col. 362.

[2] Non solum secundum veritatis mysteria, sed secundum mysterii veritatem.

Jesus Christ, and belong to the communion of his body by ecclesiastical unity? For the blessed Apostle says to them, 'Ye are the body of Christ,' &c. (1 Cor. xii. 27.) Whom he shows not only to be partakers of the sacrifice itself, but *to be themselves the holy sacrifice itself*,[1] when he directs them humbly to present themselves to God a living sacrifice, saying, 'I beseech you, brethren, by the mercies of God,' &c. (Rom. xii. 1.) Which also St. Peter teaching in like manner, says, 'And ye also as living stones,' &c. (1 Pet ii. 5.) Whence the blessed Paul, when in a certain place he had said, 'The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? and the bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of the Lord?' (1 Cor. x. 16.), IN ORDER THAT HE MIGHT SHOW, THAT WE ARE THE TRUE BREAD ITSELF AND THE TRUE BODY,[2] immediately added, 'For we being many are one bread and one body, all of us who partake of that one bread.' Whence he says in another place, 'Ye are one body and one spirit,' &c. (Eph. iv. 5.) And again, 'But speaking the truth in love,' &c. (ibid. 15.) For also insisting upon the view that *we are the flesh of the Lord*,[3] he says, 'For no man ever yet hated his own flesh,' &c. (Eph. v. 29.) Wherefore since 'we being many are one bread and one body,' then does each one begin to be a partaker of that one bread, when he begins to be a member of that one body, which, in each of its members, when it is joined in baptism to the head Christ, is then at once truly offered to God a living victim. For by that gift of birth he so becomes a sacrifice as he becomes also a temple. Which the blessed Apostle teaching, says, 'Know ye not that ye are the temple of God,' &c. (1 Cor iii. 16.) Therefore how can it be, that he who becomes a member of the body of Christ does not receive that which he becomes? When in truth he becomes *a true member of that body of which body there is a sacrament in the sacrifice.* Therefore by the regeneration of holy baptism he *becomes that which he is about to take from the sacrifice of the altar.* Which also we well know that the holy Fathers without hesitation believed and taught." [4]

He then proceeds to quote the Sermon of Augustine which I

[1] Quos ostendit non solum ipsius sacrificii participes, sed ipsum sanctum sacrificium esse.

[2] Ut nos esse ipsum verum panem verumque corpus ostenderet.

[3] Carnem Domini nos esse confirmans.

[4] Qui ergo membrum corporis Christi fit, quomodo non accipit quod ipse fit? quando utique illius fit verum corporis membrum, cujus corporis est in sacrificio sacramentum. Hoc ergo fit ille regeneratione sancti baptismatis, quod est de sacrificio sumpturus altaris. Quod etiam sanctos Patres indubitanter credidisse ac docuisse cognoscimus.

have just placed before the reader in support of his argument, and adds,—

"I think that my argument is confirmed by the sermon of the celebrated doctor, Augustine; and that there is no room for any one to doubt, that each one of the faithful is then made a partaker of the body and blood of the Lord, when in baptism he is made a member of the body of Christ, and is not separated from that communion of the bread or cup, although, before he eat that bread, and drink that cup, he may depart from this world, belonging to the unity of the body of Christ. To wit, he is not deprived of the participation and benefit of that sacrament, *when he himself is found to be what that sacrament* SIGNIFIES.[1] Pray for us, holy and venerable brother,"[2] &c.

True Christians, argues Fulgentius, *are* by baptism that body of Christ which is received in the Eucharist, and therefore are *received by us in that rite. They are themselves what they take from the table.* And from this he deduces the inference required for the discussion in which he was then engaged (with which we are not now concerned), that a participation of the Eucharist is not absolutely essential to the salvation of one who has been baptised.

Surely the meaning of his language is very plain; and if it were not, his concluding words abundantly show, what his doctrine was; where, speaking of true believers as the body of Christ, he speaks of them as being "*what that sacrament* SIGNIFIES."

We receive in the Eucharist the body of Christ which hung upon the cross, and also that body of Christ which consists of the company of the faithful, inasmuch as we receive that which sacramentally *signifies* both, and which also by the Divine power and blessing *brings us into communion with* both.

(14.) *The Fathers held* MULTIPRESENCE *to prove the possession of the attribute of* OMNIPRESENCE, *and so to manifest the real and proper divinity of that to which it belonged.*

One of the chief arguments by which the Fathers proved the real and proper divinity of the Holy Spirit was his *multipresence.*

Thus Ambrose, in his work on the Holy Spirit, having re-

[1] Sacramenti quippe illius participatione ac beneficio non privatur, quando ipse hoc quod illud sacramentum significat invenitur.

[2] FULGENTII RUSP. Epist. ad Ferrand. ep. xii. c. 11. Op. ed. cit. 225—228.

marked that the Holy Spirit was with the Apostles, though they were separated one from another, adds,—

"Therefore the Holy Spirit is uncircumscribed and infinite, who infused himself into the senses of the disciples throughout widely separated regions and the remote boundaries of the whole world, whom nothing can avoid or deceive. And therefore holy David says, 'Whither shall I go from thy Spirit,' &c.... Who therefore can doubt, that that is Divine which is infused simultaneously into many, and is not seen?" [1]

So Didymus of Alexandria, in his work on the Holy Spirit as translated by Jerome, after speaking of all created things as having a circumscribed substance, adds,—"But the Holy Spirit, since he is *in many*, has not a circumscribed substance;"—pointing out that he was in all the Apostles, some being in Asia, some in Scythia, and others in other nations; and that as they were far separated from one another, and the Holy Spirit dwelt in all of them, he has an uncircumscribed substance, different from that of the angels, "inasmuch as an angel who was present, for instance, to an Apostle praying in Asia, could not be present at the same time to others placed in other parts of the world." [2]

He considers simultaneous presence in different parts of the

[1] Incircumscriptus igitur et infinitus Spiritus Sanctus, qui se discipulorum sensibus per separatarum divortia discreta regionum, remotosque fines totius orbis infudit, quem nihil potest præterire vel fallere. Et ideo sanctus David ait, "Quo ibo a Spiritu tuo," &c. . . . . Quis igitur dubitet quin divinum sit, quod infunditur simul pluribus, nec videtur? AMBROS. De Spir. Sanct. lib. i. c. 7. Op. ed. Ben. tom. ii. pt. 1. col. 617.

[2] Ipse vero Spiritus Sanctus, si unus de creaturis esset, saltem circumscriptam haberet substantiam; sicut universa quæ facta sunt. Nam et si non circumscribantur loco et finibus invisibiles creaturæ, tamen proprietate substantiæ finiuntur. Spiritus autem Sanctus, cum in pluribus sit, non habet substantiam circumscriptam. Mittens quippe Jesus prædicatores doctrinæ suæ, replevit eos Spiritu; et insufflans in faciem eorum: "Accipite," inquit, "Spiritum Sanctum, et euntes docete omnes gentes:" quasi omnes cunctis gentibus mitteret. Neque enim omnes Apostoli ad omnes gentes pariter sunt profecti, sed quidam in Asiam, quidam in Scythiam, et alii in alias dispersi nationes, secundum dispensationem illius quem secum habebant Spiritus Sancti, quomodo et Dominum dicentem, "Vobiscum sum omnibus diebus, usque ad consummationem sæculi." . . . . Si ergo hi in extremis finibus terræ ob testimonium Dei constituti distabant inter se longissimis spatiis, aderat autem eis inhabitator Spiritus Sanctus, incircumscriptam habens substantiam, demonstratur angelica virtus ab hoc prorsus aliena. Angelus quippe qui aderat, verbi gratia, Apostolo in Asia oranti, non poterat simul eodem tempore adesse aliis in cæteris partibus mundi constitutis. DIDYMI ALEX. De Spir. Sanct. § 6. sec. interpr. Hieron.—Inter Hieron. Op. ed. cit. tom. 2. col. 112.

world as proving that what is so present is an uncircumscribed substance.

Again, Gregory Nazienzen uses exactly the same argument. He speaks of the Holy Spirit as "pervading all spirits, intelligent, pure, subtle, the angelic powers, I think, as also the prophets and apostles, at the same time, and not in the same places, but some being in one place and others in another;" "*by which*," he adds, "*the incircumscription of his nature is manifested.*"[1]

To the same effect speaks Basil of Cæsarea.

"Each of the other powers," he says, "is believed to be in a circumscribed place. For the angel that stood by the side of Cornelius was not at the same time also present to Philip, nor did he that conversed with Zacharias from the altar fill at the same time his allotted station in heaven. But the Holy Spirit is believed to have acted at the same time in Habakkuk and in Daniel at Babylon, and to have been with Jeremiah in the dungeon and with Ezekiel at Chobar. For the Spirit of the Lord fills the world..... But that which is everywhere and present throughout all with God, of what nature ought we to consider him to be?"[2]

Here the proof is not so direct, because the doctrine of the Spirit's omnipresence is not directly *deduced* from the fact of his being present simultaneously with different individuals in different parts of the world. But the impartial reader will, I think, see, that Basil's argument clearly involves a supposition of the impossibility of anything being present in more than one place at the same time, but that which is present everywhere. And that is the point of which we now are enquiring for a proof.

So Augustine says,—

"I wonder at your courage more than I can express, how, when

[1] Διὰ πάντων χωροῦν πνευμάτων, νοερῶν, καθαρῶν, λεπτοτάτων, Ἀγγελικῶν, οἶμαι, δυνάμεων, ὥσπερ καὶ Προφητικῶν καὶ Ἀποστολικῶν, κατὰ ταυτὸν, καὶ οὐκ ἐν τοῖς αὐτοῖς τόποις, ἄλλων δὲ ἀλλαχοῦ νενεμημένων, ᾧ δηλοῦται τὸ ἀπερίγραπτον. Gregor. Nazianz. Orat. 31. § 29. Op. ed. Ben. Paris. tom. i. p. 575.

[2] Τῶν μὲν οὖν ἄλλων ἑκάστη δυνάμεων ἐν περιγραπτῷ τόπῳ τυγχάνειν πεπίστευται. Ὁ γὰρ τῷ Κορνηλίῳ ἐπιστὰς ἄγγελος, οὐκ ἦν ἐν ταὐτῷ καὶ παρὰ τῷ Φιλίππῳ, οὐδὲ ὁ ἀπὸ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου τῷ Ζαχαρίᾳ διαλεγόμενος, κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν καιρὸν καὶ ἐν οὐρανῷ τὴν οἰκείαν στάσιν ἐπλήρου. Τὸ μέντοι Πνεῦμα, ὁμοῦ τε ἐν Ἀββακοὺμ ἐνεργεῖν, καὶ ἐν Δανιὴλ ἐπὶ τῆς Βαβυλωνίας πεπίστευται· καὶ ἐν τῷ καταῤῥάκτῃ εἶναι μετὰ Ἱερεμίου, καὶ μετὰ Ἰεζεκιὴλ ἐπὶ τοῦ Χοράβ. Πνεῦμα γὰρ Κυρίου πεπλήρωκε τὴν οἰκουμένην..... Τὸ δὲ πανταχοῦ ὂν, καὶ Θεῷ συμπαρὸν, τῆς ποίας προσήκει νομίζειν φύσεως; κ. τ. λ. Basil. Cæs. De Spir. Sanct. c. 23. Op. ed. Ben. Paris. iii. 46.

you so extol the Holy Spirit as to assert that he is everywhere present for the sanctification of the faithful, you should yet deny him to be God. Is he not God who fills the whole earth? For the Scripture says, The Spirit of the Lord fills the whole earth." [1]

Here the presence of the Holy Spirit with all the faithful for their sanctification, is evidently spoken of by Augustine as equivalent to omnipresence, or at least as showing, that he who is so is omnipresent.

But the words of Jerome are still more to the point, because he expressly ascribes the multipresence of Christ to his Divine nature. To the question, "Whether for the forty days after the resurrection the Lord conversed with the disciples and was nowhere else; or whether he secretly ascended to heaven and descended and was nevertheless present with his apostles?" he replies,—

"If you consider that it is the Lord the Son of God concerning whom the words are spoken, and that it is he who says, 'Do not I fill heaven and earth, saith the Lord?'.... you will not doubt, that even before the resurrection God the Word so dwelt in the Lord's body that he was both in the Father, and compassed the circle of heaven, and was in all and round about all.... For *the Divine nature* and the Word of God cannot be divided nor separated; but since it is everywhere, is whole everywhere. Therefore he was at one and the same time both with the Apostles forty days, and with the angels, and in the Father, and in the extreme bounds of the sea," &c. [2]

[1] Miror autem cor vestrum, quantum sermone explicare non possum, quomodo cum sic laudetis Spiritum Sanctum, ut cum sanctificandis fidelibus ubique asseratis esse præsentem, tamen negare audeatis Deum. Itane Deus non est, qui replevit orbem terrarum? Scriptura enim dicit, Spiritus Domini replevit orbem terrarum. AUGUST. Contra Maximin. Arian. lib. 2. c. 21. Op. ed. cit. tom. viii. col. 512.

[2] Extrema schedula continebat, Utrum post resurrectionem quadraginta diebus Dominus cum discipulis conversatus sit, et nunquam [nusquam] alibi fuerit? an latenter ad cœlum ascenderit, atque descenderit, et nihilominus Apostolis suam præsentiam non negarit? Si Dominum Dei Filium consideres, de quo sermo est, et illum esse qui loquitur: Nonne cœlum et terram ego repleo, dicit Dominus.... profecto non ambiges, etiam ante resurrectionem sic in Dominico corpore habitasse Deum verbum, ut et in Patre esset, et cœli circulum clauderet, atque in omnibus infusus esset et circumfusus..... Divina quippe natura et Dei sermo in partes secari non potest, nec locis dividi: sed cum ubique sit, totus ubique est. Erat igitur uno eodemque tempore et cum Apostolis quadraginta diebus, et cum Angelis, et in Patre, et in extremis maris finibus erat; in omnibus locis versabatur; cum

His multipresence is here expressly ascribed to his *Divine nature*, and *that nature only is supposed to be so present.*

Now if the argument of Archdeacon Wilberforce was a sound one, that a capacity of multipresence might be given by God to a created thing, such as the human nature of our Lord, this argument would not hold good. For then the multipresence of the Holy Spirit might only be the effect of a Divine gift communicated to a created being. And our Authors do not profess to hold, that any of the Divine attributes are communicated to the human nature of our Lord. They do not maintain, that the human nature of our Lord can be omnipresent.

(15.) *The Fathers assert, that Christ is absent from us so far as his human nature is concerned, and present only by his divinity.*

Thus Origen, reconciling the parable comparing our Lord to a man travelling into a far country with his promise to be with his disciples always even to the end of the world, and to be present wherever two or three are met together in his name, explains it thus,—

"According to the nature of his divinity he is not absent, but he is absent according to the dispensation of the body which he took .... For it is not as man that he is present wherever two or three are gathered together in his name, nor as man is he with us always even unto the end of the world; nor at the assemblies everywhere of the faithful is he present as man, but the Divine power which was in Jesus. We may also say the like respecting this passage; that there is no contradiction, that the very same Jesus should be everywhere in one sense, but in another sense should be absent." [1]

And he observes in the context, that "if *the power of Jesus* is

Thoma in India, cum Petro Romæ, cum Paulo in Illyrico, cum Tito in Creta, cum Andrea in Achaia, cum singulis Apostolis et Apostolicis viris, in singulis cunctisque regionibus. HIERON. Epist. ad Marcell. de quibusd. quæst. Ep. 59. § 5. Op. ed. cit. tom. i. col. 330.

[1] Secundum hanc divinitatis suæ naturam non peregrinatur, sed peregrinatur secundum dispensationem corporis quod suscepit..... Nec enim est homo, qui est ubicumque duo vel tres in nomine ejus fuerint congregati. Neque homo nobiscum est omnibus diebus usque ad consummationem sæculi. Nec congregatis ubique fidelibus homo est præsens, sed virtus divina quæ erat in Jesu. Possumus etiam talia dicere de hoc loco: nihil contrarium eum ipsum Jesum secundum quemdam quidem intellectum esse ubique, secundum alium autem peregrinari. ORIGEN. In Matth. Comment. Series. § 65. Op. iii. p. 883.

present with those who are assembled in his name, he is not absent from his own, but is always at hand to them." [1]

And these passages are the more remarkable, because, as we have seen[2], Archdeacon Wilberforce deduces from his doctrine on the Eucharist the inference, that the true meaning of such promises as that our Lord would be with his disciples to the end of the world is to be found in the real presence of his body and blood in the Eucharist. And no doubt if such a presence as the Archdeacon supposes was vouchsafed in the Eucharist, this might reasonably be supposed to be the meaning of such passages. But the Fathers attach a very different meaning to them, and therefore we may reasonably conclude, even from this fact, that they did not imagine such a presence in the Eucharist as the Archdeacon supposes.

And in another place Origen says,—

"Therefore also the Apostle, wishing to abstract us from these visible and earthly things, and to raise our minds and senses to heavenly things, exclaims, 'If ye be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above, not the things on the earth.' .... Christ is not truly to be sought on earth, but in heaven, and through him thou oughtest to offer sacrifice to God." [3]

Augustine repeatedly bears the same testimony. Thus, on the words, "The poor always ye have with you, but me ye have not always," he says,—

"He was speaking concerning the presence of his body. For as it respects his majesty, his providence, and his ineffable and invisible grace, that is fulfilled which was said by him, 'Behold I am with you always even to the end of the world.' But as it respects the flesh which the Word assumed, as it respects the circumstance that he was born of a Virgin, that he was taken by the Jews, that he was nailed to the cross, that he was taken down from the cross,

[1] Si enim virtus Jesu congregatur cum his qui congregantur in nomine ejus, non peregrinatur a suis, sed semper præsto est eis. Id. ib. p. 882.

[2] See p. 154 above.

[3] Propterea enim et Apostolus, volens abstrahere nos ab his visibilibus et terrenis, et erigere animos sensusque nostros ad cœlestia, clamat et dicit: "Si resurrexistis cum Christo, quæ sursum sunt quærite, non quæ super terram."....[Christus] utique non in terris requirendus est, sed in cœlis, et per ipsum debes offerre hostiam Deo. Origen. Comment. in Levit. hom. x. Op. ii. 246.

that he was wrapped in linen, that he was buried in a sepulchre, that he was manifested in his resurrection, 'ye have him not always with you.' . . . He ascended into heaven, and *is not here; for he is there;* he sits at the right hand of the Father; he is also here, for he has not departed by the presence of his majesty. . . . For the Church had him for a few days, according to the presence of the flesh: now it has him by faith, it does not see him with the bodily eye." [1]

Again,—

"He is always with us by his divinity; but unless he departed from us in body, we should always carnally see his body, and never spiritually believe." [2]

"On that account did the Lord absent himself in body from every Church, and ascended into heaven that faith might be edified." [3]

This language is totally different from what could be used by the Authors under review. It is true they do not profess to see him, and therefore require the exercise of faith to realize his presence. But the language of Augustine is, that he cannot be seen, *because he is in heaven.*

Again he says,—

"According to the presence of his glory and divinity he is always with the Father; according to his bodily presence, he is now above the heavens at the right hand of the Father; but according to the presence of faith, he is in all Christians." [4]

But according to our Authors he is also, according to his

[1] Loquebatur de præsentia corporis sui. Nam secundum majestatem suam, secundum providentiam, secundum ineffabilem et invisibilem gratiam, impletur quod ab eo dictum est, Ecce ego vobiscum sum usque ad consummationem sæculi. Secundum carnem vero quam Verbum assumsit, secundum id quod de virgine natus est, secundum id quod a Judæis prehensus est, quod ligno confixus, quod de cruce depositus, quod linteis involutus, quod in sepulcro conditus, quod in resurrectione manifestatus, "Non semper habebitis vobiscum."... Adscendit in cœlum, et non est hic. Ibi est enim, sedet ad dexteram Patris: et hic est, non enim recessit præsentia majestatis. . . . . Habuit enim illum Ecclesia secundum præsentiam carnis paucis diebus: modo fide tenet, oculis non videt. AUGUST. In Johann. tract. 50. § 13. Op. iii. pt. 2. col. 460.

[2] Semper quidem divinitate nobiscum est: sed nisi corporaliter abiret a nobis, semper ejus corpus carnaliter videremus, et numquam spiritaliter crederemus. ID. Serm. 143. § 4. Op. v. 482.

[3] Ideo enim Dominus absentavit se corpore ab omni Ecclesia, et adscendit in cœlum, ut fides ædificetur. ID. Serm. 235. Op. v. 690.

[4] Secundum præsentiam pulcritudinis et divinitatis suæ semper cum Patre est; secundum præsentiam corporalem jam supra cœlos ad dexteram Patris est; secundum præsentiam vero fidei in omnibus Christianis est. ID. Serm. 361. § 7. Op. v. 983.

bodily presence, in the Eucharistic elements, of which Augustine makes no mention.

Again, speaking of the instruction to be given to the Jews respecting Christ, he says,—

"Let them hear and lay hold of him. They reply, How shall I lay hold of one who is absent? How shall I put forth my hand into heaven, that I may hold him who sits there? Put forth faith, and thou hast hold of him. Thy forefathers held him in the flesh, do thou hold him in heart; since Christ though absent is also present. Unless he were present, he could not be held by ourselves. But since that is true which he says, Behold I am with you always even to the end of the world, he has both departed and is here, and hath returned and does not forsake us: *for he hath taken his body into heaven, he has not taken away his majesty from the world.*" [1]

Again,—

"See him ascending, believe in him *absent*, hope in him as to come; but nevertheless by his secret mercy feel him also as present. For he who ascended into heaven, that he might be taken from your eyes, promised you saying, Lo, I am with you always, even to the end of the world." [2]

I conclude the extracts from Augustine with one more passage, which could not be more pertinent if it had been written for the purpose.

"Doubt not therefore, that the man Christ Jesus is now there whence he is to come at a future time; and lay up in your memory and faithfully teach the Christian confession, that he rose from the dead, ascended into heaven, sitteth at the right hand of the Father, and will come from no other place to judge the quick and the dead. And he is so to come, according to the angelic testimony, as he was seen to go into heaven, that is, in the same form and substance of

[1] Audiant et teneant. Respondent, Quomodo tenebo absentem? Quomodo in cœlum manum mittam, ut ibi sedentem teneam? Fidem mitte, et tenuisti. Parentes tui tenuerunt in carne, tu tene corde: quoniam Christus absens etiam præsens est. Nisi præsens esset, a nobis ipsis teneri non posset. Sed quoniam verum est quod ait, Ecce ego vobiscum sum usque ad consummationem sæculi, et abiit, et hic est; et rediit, et nos non deserit: corpus enim suum intulit cœlo, majestatem non abstulit mundo. Id. In Johann. Tract. 50. § 4. Op. iii. pt. 2. col. 458.

[2] Videte adscendentem, credite in absentem, sperate venientem; sed tamen per misericordiam occultam etiam sentite præsentem. Ille enim qui adscendit in cœlum, ut tolleretur ab oculis vestris, promisit vobis dicens, Ecce ego vobiscum sum usque in consummationem sæculi. Id. Enarr. in Psalm. 46. § 7. Op. tom. iv. col. 308.

flesh; to which indeed he gave immortality, but did not take away its nature. *As it respects this form, he is not to be supposed to be spread abroad everywhere. For we must take heed, that we do not so maintain the divinity of the man as to take away the truth of the body.* For it does not follow, that what is in God is everywhere as God is. For even of us the perfectly true Scripture says, that in him we live and move and have our being; and yet we are not everywhere as he is. But that man is otherwise in God, inasmuch as that God was otherwise in man, namely in a peculiar and singular manner. For God and man is one person, and both make one Christ Jesus; *he is everywhere by that which is God, but he is in heaven by that which is man.*" [1]

And a little further on in the same treatise or letter, he says,—

"Doubt not, that Christ is wholly present everywhere as God, and is in the same temple of God as indwelling God, and *in some one place of heaven on account of the measure (or limit) of a true body.*" [2]

Thus also Athanasius, in a passage already quoted,[3] giving a spiritual meaning to our Lord's words in John vi., says,—

"For to how many men would his body be sufficient for meat, that this should be the food of the whole world? But he therefore made mention of *the ascension of the Son of man into heaven*, that he might withdraw them from the contemplation of *the body*, and

[1] Noli itaque dubitare ibi nunc esse hominem Christum Jesum, unde venturus est; memoriterque recole, et fideliter tene Christianam confessionem, quoniam resurrexit a mortuis, adscendit in cœlum, sedet ad dexteram Patris, nec aliunde quam inde venturus est ad vivos mortuosque judicandos. Et sic venturus est, illa angelica voce testante, quemadmodum ire visus est in cœlum, id est, in eadem carnis forma atque substantia; cui profecto immortalitatem dedit, naturam non abstulit. Secundum hanc formam non est putandus ubique diffusus. Cavendum est enim, ne ita divinitatem adstruamus hominis, ut veritatem corporis auferamus. Non est autem consequens, ut quod in Deo est, ita sit ubique ut Deus. Nam et de nobis veracissima Scriptura dicit, quod in illo vivimus, movemur et sumus; nec tamen sicut ille ubique sumus. Sed aliter homo ille in Deo, quoniam aliter et Deus ille in homine, proprio quodam et singulari modo. Una enim persona Deus et homo est, et utrumque est unus Christus Jesus; ubique per id quod Deus est, in cœlo autem per id quod homo. ID. Lib. ad Dardanum, seu Epist. 187. c. 3, or, § 10. Op. ii. 518.

[2] Christum .... ubique totum præsentem esse non dubites tamquam Deum, et in eodem templo Dei esse tamquam inhabitantem Deum, et in loco aliquo cœli propter veri corporis modum. ID. ib. c. 13, or, § 41. col. 526.

[3] See p. 114 above.

that they might learn, that the flesh of which he spoke was heavenly food from above, and spiritual nourishment given by him."

He clearly considered the fact of the body of Christ being in heaven sufficient to show that it could not be here also, and that our Lord could not have been speaking of any real eating of the substance of that body. Had he supposed that its substance could be here in a spiritual form, while in heaven in a material form, he could not have spoken thus.

We have repeated testimonies to the same effect in Cyril of Alexandria.

Thus he says,—

"Rightly considering, that though he is now *absent from the world so far as the flesh is concerned*, his divine and ineffable nature will be present none the less to those who are in him, and will rule over all things, being absent from nothing that exists, nor at a distance from any, but everywhere present to all things."[1]

Again,—

"Christ says, that he will be present but a little time longer with his disciples, not as about to be wholly absent from them, and in every respect, and altogether separated from them; for he is with us always even unto the end of the world, according to his own saying; but because he will *not be with them with the flesh*, as yesterday and the day before; for the time was at hand, or rather fully come, of his departure from this world to the Father and his return to heaven.[2] But it is necessary for those who think rightly, and have a firm faith, to be persuaded, that though he is *absent from us in the flesh*, having gone hence to God even the Father,[3] yet he takes care of all things by his divine power, and is simultaneously present to those that love him. For on this account he said, 'Verily, verily, I say unto you, Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them.' For as when he was yet conversant with men, and existed on the earth in flesh, he filled the heavens, and was then present with the holy angels, and did not quit the

[1] Φρονοῦντες ὀρθῶς, ὅτι κἂν ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου γένηται διὰ τὴν σάρκα, παρέσται πάλιν οὐδὲν ἧττον τοῖς ἐν αὐτῷ, καὶ ἐπιστατήσει τοῖς ὅλοις ἡ θεία τε καὶ ἄῤῥητος αὐτοῦ φύσις οὐδενὸς ἀποδημοῦσα τῶν ὄντων, ἢ ἀπολιμπανομένη τινὸς, πανταχῆ δὲ τοῖς πᾶσι παροῦσα. CYRILL. ALEX. Comment. in Joann. lib. vi. (in c. ix. v. 5.) Op. ed. cit. tom. iv. p. 600.

[2] Ἀλλ' ὅτι μετὰ σαρκὸς οὐ συνέσται, καθάπερ ἐχθὲς, καὶ τρίτην· ἦν δὲ ἐπὶ θύραις, μᾶλλον δὲ εἴσω θυρῶν ὁ καιρὸς τῆς ἐντεῦθεν ἀποδημίας πρὸς τὸν Πατέρα, καὶ τῆς ἀνόδου τῆς εἰς οὐρανόν.

[3] Εἰ καὶ ἄπεστιν ἡμῶν τῇ σαρκὶ, τὴν πρὸς Θεὸν καὶ Πατέρα στειλάμενος ἀποδημίαν.

regions above, so now also *being in heaven in his own flesh*,[1] he fills the earth, and is present to his followers. But observe how, although anticipating his departure in respect to *the flesh* only,[2]—for he is always with us by the power of the Godhead,—he says that he shall be with us but a little time longer, wholly and perfectly designating himself from a part, that no one might attempt to divide the one Christ into two sons," &c.[3]

Again,—

"For I will come again to you, and, *though absent in body*, will as God fortify you with consolations."[4]

Again,—

"Was therefore the Saviour absent from his disciples on his return to the Father, and yet present with them by the energy and power and grace of the Spirit? How, or in what way? For he does not speak falsely when he says, 'Lo, I am with you always even to the end of the world.' There is no manner of doubt that it is *so far as concerns the flesh and his bodily presence*."[5]

Again,—

"For although he is *absent in flesh*, having presented himself for us to the Father, and sat down at the right hand of him who begat him, yet nevertheless he dwells with those who are worthy by the Spirit, and is ever present with the saints; for he promised that he would not leave us desolate."[6]

Again, speaking of the grief of the Apostles at the departure of our Lord from the earth, he says,—

"I will not hesitate to say, that they ought not only to have had respect to the fleshly presence of our Saviour Christ, but to have understood, that although he might be separated from converse with

[1] Ὑπάρχων ἐν οὐρανοῖς μετὰ τῆς ἰδίας σαρκὸς.

[2] Καίτοι κατὰ μόνην τὴν σάρκα χωρίζεσθαι προσδοκῶν.

[3] Id. ib. lib. ix. (in c. xiii. v. 33.) ib. p. 747.

[4] Συνέσομαι γὰρ πάλιν ὑμῖν, καὶ ἀπὼν τῷ σώματι ἀνατειχιῶ πάλιν ταῖς εὐμενείαις ὡς Θεὸς. Id. ib. lib. x. (in c. xiv. v. 27.) ib. p. 839.

[5] Ἆρ' οὖν ἀπενοσφίζετο τῶν μαθητῶν ὁ σωτὴρ ἀναφοιτήσας πρὸς τὸν Πατέρα, καὶ συνῆν αὐτοῖς τῇ τοῦ Πνεύματος ἐνεργείᾳ τε καὶ δυνάμει καὶ χάριτι; Πῶς, ἢ κατὰ τίνα τρόπον; Οὐ γὰρ ψεύδεται λέγων· ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ μεθ' ὑμῶν, κ. τ. λ. Πλὴν ὅσον εἰς σάρκα καὶ τὴν μετὰ σώματος παρουσίαν, οὐδαμόθεν ἀμφίβολον. Id. ib. lib. x. (in c. xvi. vv. 4, 5.) ib. p. 916.

[6] Εἰ γὰρ καὶ ἀποδημεῖ σαρκὶ παραστήσας ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν τῷ Πατρὶ, καὶ καθίσας ἐκ δεξιῶν τοῦ γεννήσαντος, ἀλλ' ἐναυλίζεται τοῖς ἀξίοις διὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος, καὶ συνέστι τοῖς ἁγίοις διὰ παντός· ἐπηγγείλατο γὰρ οὐκ ἀφήσειν ἡμᾶς ὀρφανούς. Id. ib. lib. xi. (in c. xvi. v. 16.) ib. p. 933.

them according to the flesh, and although he might not perhaps be seen with the eyes of the body, yet that they ought altogether to look upon him as present and conversant with them always *by the power of the Godhead*.... It behoved the disciples by no means to be ignorant, that although he might be absent from them in body, he would not altogether forsake them, but would certainly be present with them according to *the unspeakable manner of his divine power*." [1]

Again, he says of our Lord that,—

"As he kept his disciples while he was with them upon earth by his humanity, so he will keep them also when *absent* by divine power through the excellency of his own essence; for *the Godhead* is *not local*, and is by no means absent from any of the things that exist." [2]

And he tells us, that the Holy Spirit takes the place of Christ's presence with his disciples, observing,—

"And that his Spirit *fills the place of the presence and the power of Christ*, dwelling in his saints, and teaches all things which he himself spoke to us, Paul again will equally manifest to us, saying, 'For this cause I bow my knees,' &c. (Eph. iii. 14 et seq.)" [3]

And again,—

"He is present with us; he has not left us desolate; but has sent us *instead of himself* the Comforter, and *by him* is present to those that love him, and will give us assurance of this, saying, 'Lo I am with you always, &c.'" [4]

[1] Οὐκ ὀκνητέον εἰπεῖν, ὡς ἔδει μὴ μόνον εἰς τὴν ἔνσαρκον παρούσιαν ἀποβλέπειν τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Χριστοῦ, εἰδέναι δὲ δὴ ὅτι καὶ εἰ τῆς πρὸς αὐτοὺς συνουσίας ἀπονοσφίζοιτο κατὰ σάρκα, καὶ εἰ μὴ τοῖς τοῦ σώματος ὁρῷτο τυχὸν ὀφθαλμοῖς, ἀλλά γε παρόντα, καὶ συνόντα διὰ παντὸς, τῇ τῆς θεότητος ἐξουσίᾳ χρὴν δήπου πάντως ἐννοεῖν. .... Χρὴν δήπου πάντως μὴ ἀγνοῆσαι τοὺς μαθητὰς, ὡς εἰ καὶ ἀπεῖναι γένοιτο σωματικῶς, οὐκ ἀπολειφθήσεται παντελῶς, συνέσται δὲ πάντως, κατὰ τὸν ἄῤῥητον τῆς θεοπρεποῦς ἐξουσίας λόγον. Id. ib. lib. xi. (in c. xvii. v. 12.) ib. p. 973.

[2] Ὥσπερ τετήρηκεν ἔτι συνὼν ἐπὶ γῆς διὰ τὸ ἀνθρώπινον, οὕτω τηρήσει καὶ ἀπὼν θεϊκῶς διὰ τὸ τῆς ἰδίας οὐσίας ἐξαίρετον· οὐ γὰρ ἐν τόπῳ τὸ θεῖον, ἄπεστι δὲ παντελῶς τῶν ὄντων οὐδενός. Id. ib. (v. 13.) ib. p. 977.

[3] Ὅτι δὲ τὴν αὐτοῦ Χριστοῦ παρουσίαν τε καὶ δύναμιν ἀναπληροῖ τὸ Πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ, τοῖς ἁγίοις ἐνοικοῦν, καὶ πάντα διδάσκει, ἅπερ αὐτὸς λελάληκε πρὸς ἡμᾶς, πάλιν ἡμῖν οὐδὲν ἧττον ὁ Παῦλος σαφηνιεῖ, λέγων· Τούτου χάριν, κ. τ. λ. Id. ib. lib. x. (in c. xiv. v. 26.) ib. p. 838.

[4] Ἀλλὰ καὶ σύνεστιν ἡμῖν· οὐ γὰρ ἀφῆκεν ἡμᾶς ὀρφανούς· πέπομφε δὲ ἡμῖν ἀνθ' ἑαυτοῦ τὸν Παράκλητον, καὶ σύνεστι δι' αὐτοῦ τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτὸν, καὶ πληροφορήσει, λέγων, Ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ μεθ' ὑμῶν, κ. τ. λ. Id. Comment. in Zachar. (in c. viii. v. 7.) Op. tom. iii. p. 718.

Now these testimonies entirely negative the idea, that Cyril could have held, that the substance of Christ's flesh, in any form, is continually present with us. For he does not speak of the absence of his flesh only so far as its *visible* presence is concerned, or in any certain respects, but of its complete and total absence; and this on account of its having gone to heaven; implying that it cannot be here because of its being in heaven; and he tells us that its place is supplied by the Holy Spirit. Now all these things are totally inconsistent with the notion of the real presence of the substance of that flesh, in any form, by whatever *name* it may be called, in the Eucharist.

There is also a passage in Chrysostom which is irreconcilable with the notion of his holding a real bodily presence of our Lord in the Eucharistic elements. For, commenting on 1 Cor. xi. 29, "He that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself," he says,—

"For as *his presence*, which brought to us those great and unspeakable blessings, tended to the greater condemnation of those who did not receive it, so also the mysteries become the causes of greater punishment to those who unworthily partake of them." [1]

He could not thus have contrasted his "presence" with "the mysteries," if his real bodily presence were vouchsafed in "the mysteries."

To the same effect speaks Vigilius Bishop of Thapsus. On the words, "If I go not away, the Comforter will not come to you," after observing that our Lord "is everywhere with a like divinity with the Father, which no place contains," he says,—

"Whence therefore and whither does he say that he will go, or how does he assert that he will approach to the Father, from whom beyond doubt he never departed? But this was to go to the Father and depart from us, namely, to remove from this world the nature which he had taken of us. You see therefore that it belonged to the same nature to be taken away and depart from us, which in the end of the times is to be restored to us, according to the saying of the angels proclaiming, 'This same Jesus that is taken from you,'

[1] "Ωσπερ γὰρ ἡ παρουσία αὐτοῦ, ἡ τὰ μεγάλα ἐκεῖνα καὶ ἀπόῤῥητα κομίσασα ἡμῖν ἀγαθὰ, τοὺς μὴ δεξαμένους αὐτὴν μᾶλλον κατέκρινεν· οὕτω καὶ τὰ μυστήρια μείζονος ἐφόδια κολάσεως γίνεται τοῖς ἀναξίως μετέχουσι. CHRYSOST. Comment. in 1 Cor. hom. 28. (in c. xi. v. 29.) Op. x. 251.

&c. (Acts i.) For observe the miracle; observe the mystery of *the property of each nature.* The Son of God, who *as it respects his humanity departed from us,* he says to us, 'Lo, I am with you always,' &c. If he is with us, how has he departed from us? If he is with us, why does he say, 'The days shall come, when ye shall desire to see one of the days of the Son of man, and ye shall not see it?' But he is with us, and he is not with us. Because those whom he left, and from whom he departed in his humanity, he has not left nor deserted by his divinity. For as it respects the form of a servant, *which he has taken from us into heaven, he is absent from us;* as it respects the form of God, in which he does not depart from us on earth, he is present with us; nevertheless the present and the absent is himself one and the same to us." [1]

He repeats the same in another passage, where he says, that since the flesh of Christ "is now in heaven, it certainly is not on earth;" [2] but the whole passage will be quoted more at length on the next head.

The testimony of Fulgentius to the same effect is very decisive, but it will come more properly under the next head, in which we shall show the sentiments of the Fathers as to the possibility of Christ's human body being in more places than one at the same time.

Ambrose, in like manner, speaks of our Lord as altogether absent, so far as his human nature is concerned; which would not be the case, if that nature was substantially present in any way in

[1] Cum Patre enim ubique est totus pari divinitate, quam nullus continet locus. .... Unde ergo et quo se iturum dicit, aut quomodo se ad Patrem perrecturum adserit, a quo sine dubio nunquam recessit? Sed hoc erat ire ad Patrem et recedere a nobis, auferre de hoc mundo naturam quam susceperat ex nobis. Vides ergo eidem naturæ proprium fuisse ut auferretur et abiret a nobis, quæ in fine temporum reddenda est nobis, secundum attestantium vocem angelorum, Hic Jesus qui receptus est a vobis, sic veniet, quemadmodum vidistis eum euntem in cœlum. Nam vide miraculum, vide utriusque naturæ proprietatis mysterium. Dei filius qui secundum humanitatem suam recessit a nobis, hic ait nobis, Ecce ego vobiscum sum, &c. Si nobiscum est, quomodo recessit? Si nobiscum est, quomodo ait, Venient dies quando desideretis diem unum Filii hominis, et non videbitis? Sed et nobiscum est, et non est nobiscum. Quia quos reliquit et a quibus discessit humanitate sua, non reliquit nec deseruit divinitate sua. Per formam enim servi, quam abstulit a nobis in cœlum, absens est nobis: per formam Dei, qua non recedit a nobis in terris, præsens est nobis, tamen et præsens et absens ipse unus idemque est nobis. VIGIL. TAPS. Contra Eutych. &c. lib. i. c. 3. Inter Scripta Vet. Lat. de una pers. et duab. nat. Domini, &c., ed. Simler. Tiguri. 1571. fol. fol. 90.

[2] Nunc quia in cœlo est, non est utique in terra. ID. ib. iv. 4. ib. fol. 100. See the whole passage, p. 313 below.

the Eucharist. I shall quote the passage fully under a subsequent head, and therefore confine myself here to the following portion of it :—

"Therefore thou didst ascend in respect to us, that we might follow thee with our minds .... Therefore we ought not to seek thee on the earth, nor in the earth, nor according to the flesh, if we wish to find thee."[1]

So Leo the Great says,—

"Our Lord Jesus Christ being taken up into heaven in the sight of his disciples on the fortieth day after his resurrection *terminated his bodily presence*, being about to remain on the right hand of the Father until the times divinely foreappointed for multiplying the sons of the Church are fulfilled, and he comes in the same flesh in which he ascended to judge the quick and the dead. Therefore what was the object of sight in our Redeemer *has passed into sacraments ;* and, that faith might be more excellent and stable, DOCTRINE *has succeeded to vision*, the authority of which the hearts of believers illuminated by rays from above might follow." [1]

This passage is utterly irreconcilable with the notion of a bodily presence in the Eucharist.

So Gregory the Great on the words, "These words have I spoken to you being yet present with you," says,—

"When would he not be present with them, who, when about to ascend to heaven, promises, saying, 'Behold I am with you always, &c.?' But the Incarnate Word both remains and departs: he departs in *body*, he remains in his *divinity*."[3]

Nor should I omit to notice under this head some of those passages in the Fathers in which they speak of the Eucharist as being left to us as a *memorial* of one who has *gone from us*.

[1] See p. 320 below.

[2] Dominus noster Jesus Christus quadragesimo post resurrectionem die coram discipulis elevatus in cœlum corporalis præsentiæ modum fecit, mansurus in Patris dextera, donec tempora multiplicandis Ecclesiæ filiis divinitus præstituta peragantur, et ad judicandos vivos et mortuos in eadem carne in qua ascendit adveniat. Quod itaque Redemptoris nostri conspicuum fuit in sacramenta transivit ; et, ut fides excellentior esset ac firmior, visioni doctrina successit, cujus authoritatem supernis illuminata radiis credentium corda sequerentur. LEONIS MAGN. Serm. 74. (De ascens. Dom. 2.) cap. 2. Op. ed. cit. i. 293, 294.

[3] Quando non maneret apud nos, qui ascensurus cœlum promittit, dicens, Ecce ego vobiscum sum omnibus diebus, &c.? Sed Verbum Incarnatum et manet et recedit: recedit corpore, manet divinitate. GREGOR. MAGN. Homil. in Evangel. lib. ii. hom. 30. § 2. Op. ed. Ben. Par. tom. i col. 1576.

Thus Primasius, in a passage the former part of which has been already quoted,[1] says,—

"God our Saviour gave us an example, that as often as we do this, we should have in mind that Christ died for us all. Therefore it is called by us the Body of Christ, that when we shall have remembered this, we may not be ungrateful to his grace; just as if any one dying should leave to one whom he loves any pledge, which he after his death, whenever he sees, cannot restrain himself from weeping, if he sincerely loved him."[2]

A similar remark is made by the author of the Commentary on the Epistles of St. Paul ascribed to Jerome, when writing on the same Scripture in 1 Cor. xi. On the words in vv. 23, 24, "took bread, and when he had given thanks he brake it," &c., he says,—

"That is, giving his blessing even when he was about to suffer, he left us a last commemoration or memorial. Just as if any one going to another country should leave to one whom he loved any pledge; in order that, as often as he looked at it, he might be able to call to mind his kindnesses and friendly acts; which he, if he perfectly loved him, would not be able to look at without great regret or lamentation."[3]

And much to the same effect speaks Augustine,—

"The flesh and blood of this sacrifice before the coming of Christ was promised by representative victims, in the Passion of Christ was rendered in very truth, after the ascension of Christ is celebrated by *a sacrament of remembrance*."[4]

[1] See p. 242 above.

[2] Salvator Deus exemplum dedit, ut quotiescunque hoc facimus, in mente habeamus quod Christus pro nobis omnibus mortuus est. Ideo nobis dicitur, Corpus Christi, ut cum hoc recordati fuerimus, non simus ingrati gratiæ ejus; quemadmodum si quis moriens relinquat ei quem diligit aliquod pignus, quod ille, post mortem ejus, quandocunque viderit, nunquid potest lacrymis continere, si eum perfecte dilexerit. PRIMASII Comment. in 1 Cor. c. xi. Inter Biblioth. Patr. ed. Migne, tom. 68. col. 534.

[3] Hoc est, benedicens, etiam passurus, ultimam nobis commemorationem sive memoriam dereliquit. Quemadmodum si quis peregre proficiscens aliquod pignus ei, quem diligit, derelinquat: ut quotiescunque illud viderit, possit ejus beneficia et amicitias memorari: quod ille, si perfecte dilexit, sine ingenti desiderio non potest videre vel fletu. PSEUD-HIERON. Comment in Epist. 1. ad Corinth. c. xi. 23, 24. Op. Hieron. ed. cit. tom. xi.

[4] Hujus sacrificii caro et sanguis ante adventum Christi per victimas similitudinum promittebatur; in Passione Christi per ipsam veritatem reddebatur; post adscensum Christi per sacramentum memoriæ celebratur. AUGUST. Contra Faustum, lib. xx. c. 21. Op. viii. 247.

This language is utterly irreconcilable with the notion of the real bodily presence of Christ in the Eucharistic elements. According to Archdeacon Wilberforce's repeated statements, the presence which he supposes to be in or under the elements makes the Eucharist a *continuation* of the sacrifice offered on the cross; which is quite inconsistent with the language of Augustine in this place. And the same language is used by many other of the Fathers, some of whose statements to this effect the reader will find below in the Appendix to this work.

(16.) *The Fathers assert, that Christ's risen body can only be in one place.*

The Authors under review maintain, that the substance of Christ's Body can be, in a spiritual form, in any number of places at one and the same time. But the Fathers expressly assert, that Christ's Body, even as it exists subsequent to its resurrection, can only be in one place. And they assert this in general terms, such as to exclude the notion of their maintaining any such distinction as that imagined by our Authors of a *solid corporal* and a *spiritual corporal*[1] presence.

This immediately follows from many of the passages given in the last head, but it is still more expressly maintained in those I am about to quote.

The sentiments of Augustine are very clear from the extracts I have given from him in the last head. He tells us, that our Lord, as man, "ascended into heaven, and is not here, *for he is there;*"[2] and again, that "he is so to come, as he was seen to go into heaven, that is, in the same form and substance of flesh; to which indeed he gave immortality, but did *not take away its nature. As it respects this form he is not to be supposed to be spread abroad everywhere. For we must take heed, that we do not so maintain the divinity of the man as to take away the truth of the body.* For it does not follow, that what is in God is everywhere as God is . . . . he is everywhere by that which is God, but he is *in heaven* by that which is man;"[3] and that he is "*in some one place of heaven on account of the measure of a true body.*"[4]

[1] I am obliged to use this self-contradictory phraseology to express their doctrine.

[2] See p. 299 above. [3] See p. 300, 301 above. [4] See p. 301 above.

And in the same treatise from which these two last extracts are made he remarks generally,—"Take away from bodies certain limits of place, and they will be nowhere, and inasmuch as they will be nowhere, they will not exist at all." [1]

And to these we may add the following,—

"He went away by that which was man, and he remained by that which was God; he went away by that which was *in one place*, he remained by that which was everywhere." [2]

And the context of this passage will enable us to meet an objection which the Romanists have brought against a passage just quoted, in which Augustine says,—"as it respects this *form* he is not to be supposed to be spread abroad everywhere." The Romanists, with our authors, admit, that Christ's body, according to its external shape or form, can only be in one place, but maintain, that it can be, in substance, in many.[3] They would therefore explain the word "form," as used by Augustine in that passage, in that sense; though the next sentence shows, that he is speaking of *the manhood of Christ*, for he immediately adds, "For we must take heed, that we do not so maintain the divinity of the man as to take away *the truth of the body*." And he also adds further, that "he is everywhere by that which is God, but he is in heaven by *that which is man*."

But in the context of the passage just quoted, referring to Phil. ii. 6., he says, "The form of a servant was added to him, the form of God did not depart from him; the former was assumed, the latter was not lost." [4]

Our authors cannot hesitate to admit, that what is here referred to, in the phrase "the form of a servant," is *the manhood of Christ;* and the mode of expression is the same.

But, in fact, the mind of Augustine, as to the doctrine in question, is clear from the other passages. He maintains, that that which is man in Christ, that is, Christ's manhood, can only

[1] Nam spatia locorum tolle corporibus, nusquam erunt, et quia nusquam erunt, nec erunt. AUGUST. Lib. ad Dard. seu Ep. 187. c. 6, or, § 18. Op. ii. 520.

[2] Ibat per id quod homo erat, et manebat per id quod Deus erat: ibat per id quod uno loco erat, manebat per id quod ubique erat. AUGUST. In Johann. tract. 78. § 1. Op. iii. pt. 2. col. 508.

[3] This is fully met by Bishop Jewel in his "Defence of the Apology" against Harding. Pt. 2. c. 1. div. 1. Works, P. S. ed. vol. 3. pp. 259—263.

[4] Forma quippe servi accessit, non forma Dei recessit: hæc est assumta, non illa consumta. AUGUST. In Johann. tract. 78. § 1. Op. iii. pt. 2. col. 509.

be in one place, and this must apply to the substance of that manhood.

But there is another passage of Augustine, giving a still more express testimony on the subject. For he says,—

"Therefore let us so hear the Gospel, as if it were the Lord present; nor let us say, O happy they who could see him! .... The Lord is above, but even here is the truth which is the Lord.[1] For the body of the Lord in which he rose can be contained in one place [or rather, ccording to the reading of Gratian, Peter Lombard, and Aquinas, when quoting the passage, *must be in one place*]; his truth is spread abroad everywhere. Therefore let us hear the Lord," &c. [2]

Whichever reading may be adopted in this place, it is evident, from the general bearing of the passage, that the words were intended to imply, that our Lord's body was circumscribed by the limits of place; otherwise the contrast between the *local* nature of his *body* and the *diffusion* of his *truth* does not hold.

It may be added, that in a sermon attributed to Augustine, though not considered as his by his Benedictine Editors, it is said, that the two substances in Christ "always remain in their own properties." [3]

The passages I have quoted, be it observed, are spoken not of bodies generally, but *expressly of the human nature of our Lord.*

I will add one passage out of the multitude that might be found in Augustine's works, in which he speaks generally on the nature of bodies, and which shows the impossibility of his holding

[1] Veritas Dominus. Probably the true reading (which I suspect has often been corrupted through the contractions used in the MSS.) was *veritas Domini, the truth of the Lord,* agreeably to *veritas ejus,* which occurs just after.

[2] Nos itaque sic audiamus Evangelium, quasi præsentem Dominum; nec dicamus, O illi felices qui eum videre potuerunt! .... Sursum est Dominus: sed etiam hic est veritas Dominus. Corpus enim Domini in quo resurrexit, uno loco esse potest: veritas ejus ubique diffusa est. Dominum ergo audiamus, &c. AUGUST. In Johann. tract. 30. § 1. Op. iii. pt. 2. col. 375. But instead of the words, *uno loco esse potest,* which less clearly express the evident meaning of Augustine, the true reading, as sanctioned by great authority, probably is, *uno loco esse oportet.* And the Benedictine Editors themselves add the following note,—"In verbis illis, *uno loco esse potest,* Editi et MSS. quos considerare nobis licuit, omnes conveniunt: tametsi Ivo Decr. p. 2. c. 3. Gratianus De consecr. dist. 2. c. *Prima quidem.* Magister 4. Sent. dist. 10. c. 1. postque illos Thomas Aquinas 3. p. q. 75. a. 1. sic sententiam hanc referant, *uno loco esse oportet.*"

[3] In sua semper proprietate manentes. PSEUDO-AUGUST. Serm. de myst. Trin. Op. tom. v. Append. Serm. 246. col. 284.

such a presence of Christ's body in the elements as the authors under review suppose. He says,—

"Nor can there at all be any body, either heavenly or earthly, either aerial or humid, which is not less in a part than in the whole; nor can it by any means have one part in the place occupied by another part at the same time; but having one part in one place and another in another, it is distended through the several portions of the place it occupies by an extended and separated, or rather, so to speak, separable mass." [1]

And he elsewhere reproves the notion, that when it is said of the body raised from the dead, "it is raised a spiritual body," it is meant as if the body was "turned into a spirit and became a spirit." [2]

Very express also is the witness of Vigilius, bishop of Thapsus, on this point. He says,—

"When the flesh of Christ was upon earth, it was not in heaven; and *now since it is in heaven, it is not on earth;* and so completely is it not there, that according to the flesh we expect Christ will come from heaven, whom according to the Word we believe to be with us on earth. Therefore according to you [*i. e.* the Eutychians] either the Word is contained in a place with its flesh, or the flesh is everywhere with the Word, since one nature does not receive within itself contrarieties and diversities. But it is a great diversity and dissimilitude to be *circumscribed by place* and to be everywhere; and since the Word is everywhere, but *his flesh is not everywhere*, it is evident, that one and the same Christ is of both natures, and that he is everywhere according to the nature of his divinity, and is *contained within a place according to the nature of his humanity*. . . . . Therefore the one Son of God and the same made Son of man . . . . is *circumscribed by place by the nature of his flesh*, and is not limited by place by the nature of his divinity. . . . . This is the Catholic faith

[1] Nec omnino potest esse aliquod corpus, sive cœleste sive terrestre, sive aerium sive humidum, quod non minus sit in parte quam in toto: neque ullo modo possit in loco hujus partis simul habere aliam partem; sed aliud hic et aliud alibi habens per quælibet spatia locorum distanti et dividua, vel potius, ut ita dicam, sectili mole distenditur. AUGUST. Contra Epist. Manichæi. c. 16. Op. viii. 116.

[2] Nostras enim Scripturas non noverunt, nec sciunt quomodo dictum sit, "Seminatur corpus animale, surgit corpus spiritale." Non enim ita dictum est, quasi corpus vertatur in spiritum, et spiritus fiat: quia et nunc corpus nostrum quod animale dicitur, non in animam versum est et anima factum. ID. De fide et symb. c. 6. Op. vi. 115.

and confession, which Apostles have delivered, martyrs have confirmed, and the faithful to the present time preserve." [1]

The testimony of Fulgentius, also, to the same effect, is very explicit. He says, speaking of our Blessed Lord, that he was,—

"One and the same person, man *local* [*i. e.* bounded by certain definite limits in space,] as from man, and God infinite as from the Father; one and the same person, absent from heaven when he was on earth, and quitting the earth when he ascended into heaven, *according to his human substance;* but according to his divine and infinite substance, neither leaving heaven when he descended from heaven, nor quitting the earth when he ascended to heaven. Which may be known by the most certain declaration of our Lord himself, who, that he might show that his humanity was *local*, says to his disciples, 'I ascend to my Father,' &c. (Jo. xx. 17.) Also when he had said concerning Lazarus, 'Lazarus is dead,' he added, 'And I am glad for your sakes that I was not there, that ye may believe.' But showing his disciples the infiniteness of his divinity, he says, 'Lo, I am with you always,' &c. But how did he ascend into heaven, except as being *limited to place* (local) and true man? Or HOW IS HE PRESENT TO HIS FAITHFUL ONES, EXCEPT AS THE INFINITE AND TRUE GOD? .... The Son himself, that he might when placed on earth show the infiniteness of his divinity, and might teach that he was also present in heaven, *not in that human nature which he had taken when placed on earth*, but as God, which he always was, says, 'No man hath ascended into heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man who is in heaven.' (Jo. iii. 13.) *Not because the human substance of Christ was diffused everywhere*, but because one and the same Person, the Son of God and the Son of man, true God from the Father, as true man from man, although according to his true humanity he was then

[1] Quando in terra fuit [*i. e.* caro Christi], non erat utique in cœlo; et nunc quia in cœlo est, non est utique in terra; et in tantum non est, ut secundum ipsam Christum spectemus esse venturum de cœlo, quem secundum Verbum nobiscum esse credimus in terra. Igitur secundum vos, aut Verbum cum carne sua loco continetur, aut caro cum Verbo ubique est, quando una natura contrarium quid et diversum non recipit in seipsa. Diversum est autem et longe dissimile circumscribi loco, et ubique esse; et quia Verbum ubique est, caro autem ejus ubique non est, apparet unum eundemque Christum utriusque esse naturæ, et esse quidem ubique secundum naturam divinitatis suæ et loco contineri secundum naturam humanitatis suæ..... Igitur unus Dei filius idemque hominis factus filius .... circumscribitur loco per naturam carnis suæ, et loco non capitur per naturam divinitatis suæ..... Hæc est fides et confessio catholica, quam Apostoli tradiderunt, martyres roboraverunt, et fideles nunc usque custodiunt. VIGIL. TAPS. Contra Eutych. et alios. lib. iv. c. 4. ed. cit. fol. 100, 101.

locally on earth, yet according to his divinity (which is in no respect contained in place) filled heaven and earth." [1]

And again,—

"We see also that true humanity of Christ which is *local*, and the true divinity which is always infinite, intimated to us by the teaching of the Apostles. For, that the Apostle Paul might show, that the body of Christ as true man is contained in place, he says to the Thessalonians, 'How ye turned to God from idols, to serve the living and true God, and to wait for his Son from heaven, whom he raised from the dead, even Jesus' (1 Thess. i. 9, 10.); showing truly, that he will come from heaven in the body, whom he had known to be raised in the body from the dead. . . . *If the body of Christ is a true body, it certainly can be contained in a place.* . . . . The flesh of Christ may, beyond doubt, be shown to be *local*." [2]

It will be observed, that the expressions used in these passages

[1] Unus idemque homo localis ex homine, qui est Deus immensus ex Patre; unus idemque, secundum humanam substantiam, absens cœlo cum esset in terra, et derelinquens terram cum ascendisset in cœlum; secundum divinam vero immensamque substantiam, nec cœlum dimittens cum de cœlo descendit, nec terram deserens cum ad cœlum ascendit. Quod ipsius Domini certissimo potest cognosci sermone, qui ut localem ostenderet humanitatem suam, dicit discipulis suis; "Ascendo ad Patrem meum et ad Patrem vestrum, Deum meum et Deum vestrum." (Jo. xx. 17.) De Lazaro quoque cum dixisset; "Lazarus mortuus est," adjunxit dicens; "Et gaudeo propter vos, ut credatis, quoniam non eram ibi." (Jo. xi. 14, 15.) Immensitatem vero suæ divinitatis ostendens discipulis dicit; "Ecce ego vobiscum sum omnibus diebus, usque ad consummationem sæculi." (Matth. xxviii. 20.) Quomodo autem ascendit in cœlum, nisi quia localis et verus est homo? Aut quomodo adest fidelibus suis, nisi quia idem immensus et verus est Deus? .... Ipse Filius ut immensitatem divinitatis suæ in terra positus demonstraret, et non secundum hominem, quem susceperat in terra positus, sed secundum Deum, quod semper erat, præsentem se etiam cœlo doceret, ait; "Nemo ascendit in cœlum, nisi qui de cœlo descendit, Filius hominis qui est in cœlo." (Jo. iii. 13.) Non quia humana Christi substantia fuisset ubique diffusa, sed quoniam unus idemque Dei filius atque hominis filius, verus Deus ex Patre, sicut homo verus ex homine, licet secundum veram humanitatem suam localiter tunc esset in terra, secundum divinitatem tamen (quæ loco nullatenus continetur) cœlum totus impleret et terram. Fulgentii Ad Thrasimund. lib. ii. c. 17. Op. ed. Mangeant. Paris. 1684. 4to. pp. 107, 108.

[2] Istam Christi veram humanitatem, quæ localis est, et veram divinitatem, quæ immensa semper est, Apostolica quoque nobis doctrina cernimus intimari. Nam ut Christi veri hominis corpus localiter contineri Paulus monstraret Apostolus, ait ad Thessalonicenses: "Quomodo conversi estis ad Deum a simulacris, servire Deo vivo et vero, et exspectare Filium ejus de cœlis, quem suscitavit a mortuis, Jesum (1 Thess. i. 9, 10.): ipsum utique monstrans corporaliter de cœlo venturum, quem corporaliter a mortuis noverat suscitatum. .... Quod si verum est corpus Christi, loco potest utique contineri. .... Caro Christi localis absque dubitatione monstretur. Id. ib. c. 18. ib. p. 108.

of Vigilius and Fulgentius *expressly* exclude the notion, that they meant only to deny, that Christ, according to the external shape and ordinary nature of his body, can be in many places at once, and not to reject the notion that his body can be substantially in some extraordinary manner multipresent. For Vigilius says, that our Lord is "circumscribed by place *by the nature of his flesh*;" and Fulgentius says, that he "quitted the earth when he ascended into heaven, *according to his human substance*," and denies that "*the human substance* of Christ" can be "diffused everywhere," and asks "how is he present to his faithful ones, except as the infinite and true God?"

These expressions utterly shut out the admissibility of the doctrine of our Authors.

When Archdeacon Wilberforce maintains, that our Lord is present in the elements "by that *essence* and in that *substance* which belongs to him as the true Head of mankind," and that that presence is "the *essential* or *substantial* presence of Christ's Body,"[1] his doctrine is *directly*, *formally*, and *expressly* contradictory to that affirmed in the extracts just given from Augustine, Vigilius, and Fulgentius.

And it is worthy of observation, that when this very point was being discussed in the Conference at Marpurg, between Luther, Brentius, and others, on one side, and Œcolampadius with others, on the other side, and Augustine and Fulgentius had been quoted against Luther's party, it was frankly admitted by Luther,—"*You have Augustine and Fulgentius*, but the rest of the Fathers are on our side."[2]

Œcolampadius asked them to produce the Fathers on their side, but this they refused to do.[3]

A passage already quoted from Cyril of Alexandria sufficiently shows his mind on the point, where, *contrasting* the *absence* of Christ by his humanity with his *presence* by divine power, he says, "for the *Godhead* is *not* local;"[4] showing that he regarded the *humanity* of Christ to be so. And elsewhere, speaking of the generation of the Son of God, he says, that he

[1] See p. 23, above.

[2] Vos Augustinum et Fulgentium habetis, sed reliqui Patres a nobis stant. Hospinian. Hist. Sacr. pt. 2. p. 126. ed. Gen. 1681.

[3] Œcolampadius petit, ut suæ partis Patres proferant, sed recusant. Id. ib.

[4] See p. 304 above.

was generated as that which is incorporeal generates, which does not admit of section or division; for if the divine nature admitted of section or division, it would be reckoned a body; and then he adds,—"If a body, it must certainly be local, and have magnitude and quantity; and having quantity, it cannot avoid circumscription."[1]

Theodoret testifies very plainly to the same truth, as follows. After observing that the bodies of men on rising from the grave "do not lose their proper nature," he adds,—

"And the body of the Lord arose indeed incorruptible and impassible and immortal, and glorified with divine glory, and is worshipped by the heavenly powers; but nevertheless it is a body, having its former circumscription."[2]

And in another place he says,—"The Godhead only, as being uncircumscribed, is not local."[3]

So Gregory Nazianzen says, that our Saviour was "circumscribed in body, uncircumscribed in spirit."[4]

(17.) *If there was a real bodily presence of Christ in or under the elements on the table, our minds ought to be fixed on that which is on the table; but, on the contrary, the Fathers exhort us to raise our thoughts above that which is on the table to that which is in heaven.*

A striking instance of this occurs in the exhortation to be found in almost all the old Liturgies,—"Lift up your hearts," with the reply, "We lift them up unto the Lord."[5] It has been urged by Bellarmine,[6] that these words did not mean more than the lifting up of our hearts from worldly cares to the contem-

[1] Εἰ δὲ τοῦτο, καὶ ἐν τόπῳ πάντως που, καὶ ἐν μεγέθει, καὶ ποσῷ· καὶ ἐπειδὰν πεπόσωται, μὴ φευγέτω [? φευγέται] περιγραφήν. CYRILL. ALEX. De Sancta Trin. dial. 2. Op. ed. cit. tom. v. p. 447.

[2] Καὶ τὸ δεσποτικὸν τοιγαροῦν σῶμα, ἄφθαρτον μὲν ἀνέστη, καὶ ἀπαθὲς, καὶ ἀθάνατον, καὶ τῇ θείᾳ δόξῃ δεδοξασμένον, καὶ παρὰ τῶν ἐπουρανίων προσκυνεῖται δυνάμεων· σῶμα δὲ ὅμως ἐστὶ, τὴν προτέραν ἔχον περιγραφήν. THEODORET. Dial. 2. Inconfusus. Op. ed. cit. tom. iv. p. 122.

[3] Μόνον γὰρ τὸ θεῖον, ὡς ἀπερίγραφον, οὐκ ἐν τόπῳ. ID. Quæst. in Genes. c. 1. quæst. 3. Op. i. 7.

[4] Περιγραπτὸν σώματι, ἀπερίγραπτον πνεύματι. GREGOR. NAZ. Epist. ad Cledon. ep. 101. Op. ed. cit. tom. ii. p. 85.

[5] In the Clementine Liturgy, Ἄνω τὸν νοῦν. Ἔχομεν πρὸς τὸν κύριον. In others the former words are ἄνω τὰς καρδίας. In the Western Church the phrase was, *Sursum corda*.

[6] De Euchar. lib. i. § 14.

plation of spiritual and divine things. But,—not to insist on the clear meaning of the word ἄνω, *above*,—we have certainly the testimony of Augustine frequently given to its signifying our raising our minds *to heaven*. Thus, he says,—

"Go, dwell in heaven. How, say you, can I dwell in heaven, a man clothed with flesh, given up to the flesh? Precede with your heart, where you may follow with your body. Do not turn a deaf ear to the words, 'Lift up your hearts.' Lift up your heart, and no one will vex you in heaven."[1]

Again, on the words, "praise the Lord in the heavens," he says,—

"The heavenly regions are tranquil, are at peace; *there* there is always joy, no death, &c. . . . . but when we think how God may be praised there, let us lift up our heart there, and not hear without reason, 'Lift up your hearts.' Let us lift up our heart above, lest it become corrupt on earth; since what the angels do there is pleasant to us."[2]

And again,—

"But that which is said in the sacraments of the faithful, that we should 'lift up our heart to the Lord,' is the gift of the Lord . . . . Since our heart is not in our power, but must be assisted by divine aid that it may ascend, and set its affections on things which are above, where Christ sitteth at the right hand of God, not on things which are on the earth, to whom should thanks be given for this, but to our Lord God?" &c.[3]

So also is it explained by the author of the Lectures ascribed to Cyril of Jerusalem, who says,—

"After this the priest exclaims, 'Lift up your hearts.' For verily

[1] Migra, habita in cœlo. Quomodo, inquies, habito [habitabo] in cœlo, homo carne indutus, carni deditus? Corde præcede, quo sequaris corpore. Noli surdus audire, Sursum corda. Sursum cor habe, et nemo te angustabit in cœlo. AUGUST. Enarr. in Psalm. 132. § 13. Op. iv. 1114.

[2] Cœlestia tranquilla sunt, pacata sunt; ibi semper gaudium, nulla mors. . . . . Sed cum cogitamus quomodo ibi laudetur Deus, cor ibi habeamus, et non sine causa audiamus, Sursum corda. Levemus cor sursum, ne putrescat in terra: quoniam placet nobis quod ibi agunt angeli. ID. Enarr. in Psalm. 148. § 5. ib. col. 1248. See also on Ps. 85. § 6. col. 680, and on Ps. 31. § 21. col. 137.

[3] Quod ergo in sacramentis fidelium dicitur, ut sursum cor habeamus ad Dominum, munus est Domini. . . . . Cum enim non sit in nostra potestate cor nostrum, sed divino sublevetur auxilio, ut adscendat, et quæ sursum sunt sapiat, ubi Christus est in dextra Dei sedens, non quæ super terram; cui de hac tanta re agendæ sunt gratiæ, nisi hoc facienti Domino Deo nostro? ID. De dono persev. c. 13. Op. x. 554, 555.

at that solemn time it is right that we should lift up our heart to God, and not let it rest below upon the earth and earthly things. Therefore the priest solemnly exhorts us at that time to dismiss all the cares of this life and domestic anxieties, and *to keep our heart in heaven with God the friend of man.*" [1]

So Chrysostom, speaking in the style in which he delights, of the way in which we are to burst through the cloud of spiritual darkness, says that we shall do so,—

"If we shall have caught the rays of the intelligent Sun, the Sun of righteousness; if we lift up our hands *to heaven.* 'The lifting up,' he says, 'of my hands is an evening sacrifice.' If with our hands we have also lifted up our mind. *Ye who are initiated in the mysteries understand what I say.* Ye perhaps recognise what is said, and understand what I have hinted at. Let us lift up our thoughts on high." [2]

Now if the doctrine of the Authors under review is correct, we have nothing to do with heaven in this rite. According to them, we are to seek Christ, not in heaven, but as lying upon the table in or under the bread and wine. And hence Archdeacon Wilberforce [3] makes it a charge against Calvin and others, that they taught men to lift up their hearts to heaven in this rite, and accuses such teaching of being in opposition to the prayers of the antient Liturgies of the Church that the Holy Spirit would descend upon the elements, and make them the body and blood of Christ. But he must first account for similar language being used by the Liturgies themselves.

To this effect also Chrysostom speaks of the disposition that becomes a communicant. Writing on this subject and quoting

[1] Μετὰ τοῦτο βοᾷ ὁ ἱερεύς· Ἄνω τὰς καρδίας. Ἀληθῶς γὰρ κατ' ἐκείνην τὴν φρικωδεστάτην ὥραν, δεῖ ἄνω ἔχειν τὴν καρδίαν πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν, καὶ μὴ κάτω περὶ τὴν γῆν, καὶ τὰ γήϊνα πράγματα. Δυνάμει τοίνυν ὁ ἱερεὺς προτάττει κατ' ἐκείνην τὴν ὥραν, πάντας ἀφιέναι φροντίδας βιωτικὰς, μερίμνας τὰς κατ' οἶκον, καὶ ἔχειν ἐν οὐρανῷ τὴν καρδίαν πρὸς τὸν φιλάνθρωπον. Auct. sub nom. Cyrill. Hieros. Catech. Mystag. v. 3. Op. ed. cit. p. 296.

[2] Ἐὰν ἐπισπασώμεθα τοῦ νοητοῦ ἡλίου τὰς ἀκτῖνας, τοῦ ἡλίου τῆς δικαιοσύνης, ἐὰν τὰς χεῖρας εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἄρωμεν. Ἔπαρσίς, φησι, τῶν χειρῶν μου θυσία ἑσπερινή. ἐὰν μετὰ τῶν χειρῶν καὶ τὸν νοῦν ἀναλάβωμεν. Ἴστε οἱ μεμυημένοι τί λέγω· τάχα δὲ καὶ ἐπιγινώσκετε τὸ λεχθὲν, καὶ συνορᾶτε ὅπερ ᾐνιξάμην. ἐπάρωμεν εἰς ὕψος τὴν διάνοιαν. Chrysost. Comment. in Hebr. hom. xxii. (in c. xi.) Op xii. 207, 208.

[3] p. 71; 3rd ed. pp. 59, 60.

the text, "Wheresoever the carcase is, there will the eagles be gathered together" (Matth. 24. 28.), he observes,—

"He calls us eagles, showing that he who approaches to this body ought to have his mind aloft, and to have nothing common to the earth, nor to be drawn downwards and creep on the earth, but always without intermission to fly high, and to look intently to the Sun of righteousness, and to have the eye of the understanding sharp. For this is a table of eagles, not of jays."[1]

And more plainly still perhaps in the following passage :—

"As there was great difference between Aaron and Christ, an equal difference is there between us and the Jews. For behold WE HAVE OUR VICTIM ABOVE, OUR PRIEST ABOVE, OUR SACRIFICE ABOVE. Therefore let us offer such sacrifices as can be presented on that altar; no longer sheep and oxen; no longer blood and incense. All these things are abolished, and there is introduced in their stead a rational worship. But what is a rational worship? The things that are offered by the soul, the things that are offered by the spirit."[2]

So Augustine, in a passage already quoted, says,—

"How shall I lay hold of one who is absent? How shall I put forth my hand into heaven that I may hold him who sits there? Put forth faith and thou hast hold of him."[3]

This passage, though general in its application, evidently includes the Eucharistic rite, otherwise it could not have been worded in such general phraseology; for if there was a real presence of Christ's body on every communion table, the words would be without meaning.

The testimony of Ambrose to the same effect is worthy of notice :—

[1] Ἀετοὺς δὲ καλεῖ, δεικνὺς ὅτι καὶ ὑψηλὸν εἶναι δεῖ τὸν προσιόντα τῷ σώματι τούτῳ, καὶ μηδὲν πρὸς τὴν γῆν κοινὸν ἔχειν, μηδὲ κάτω σύρεσθαι καὶ ἕρπειν, ἀλλ' ἄνω πέτεσθαι διηνεκῶς, καὶ πρὸς τὸν ἥλιον τῆς δικαιοσύνης ἐνορᾶν, καὶ ὀξυδερκὲς τὸ ὄμμα τῆς διανοίας ἔχειν. Ἀετῶν γὰρ, οὐ κολοιῶν ἄυτη ἡ τράπεζα. CHRYSOST. In Epist. 1. ad Corinth. hom. xxiv. 3. Op. x. 216.

[2] Ὥσπερ πολὺ τὸ μέσον Ἀαρὼν καὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, τοσοῦτον ἡμῶν καὶ τῶν Ἰουδαίων τὸ μέσον. Ὅρα γὰρ ἄνω ἔχομεν τὸ ἱερεῖον, ἄνω τὸν ἱερέα, ἄνω τὴν θυσίαν. Οὐκοῦν τοιαύτας ἀναφέρωμεν θυσίας τὰς ἐν ἐκείνῳ δυναμένας προσφέρεσθαι τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ· οὐκέτι πρόβατα καὶ βόας, οὐκέτι αἷμα καὶ κνίσσαν· πάντα ταῦτα λέλυται, καὶ ἀντεισενήνεκται ἀντὶ τούτων ἡ λογικὴ λατρεία. Τί δὲ ἐστιν ἡ λογικὴ λατρεία; τὰ διὰ ψυχῆς, τὰ διὰ πνεύματος. ID. Comment. in Ep. ad Hebr. hom. xi. (in c. vi.) § 3. Op. xii. 114, 115.

[3] See p. 300 above.

"Thou didst descend the Son of Man, and wast not absent from the Father when thou didst descend; but thou didst descend to us; that we might see thee with our eyes and minds, that we might believe in thee. Therefore also thou didst ascend in respect to us, that we might also follow thee with our minds, whom we cannot see with our eyes..... Thou didst ascend also in respect to Paul, who, not content to follow thee alone, hath taught us also how to follow thee, and where we may find thee, saying, 'If ye therefore be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth at the right hand of God.' (Col. iii. 1.) And lest we should think this rather the office of our eyes than of our minds, he added, 'Set your affection on things which are above, not on things on the earth.' Therefore we ought not to seek thee on the earth, nor in the earth, nor according to the flesh, if we wish to find thee; for now we have not known Christ after the flesh. Moreover Stephen did not seek thee on the earth, who beheld thee standing on the right hand of God; but Mary, because she sought thee on earth, could not touch thee. Stephen touched thee because he sought thee in heaven; Stephen among the Jews saw thee when absent; Mary among the angels did not see thee when present." [1]

And so, in other passages already quoted,[2] he tells us, that while, under the Law, there was only a "shadow" of heavenly things, there is still, under the Gospel, only an "image" of them, and that in heaven only is there the *reality;* and then adds,—"Ascend therefore, O man, into heaven, and thou shalt see those things of which there was here the shadow or the image." [3]

To the same effect Jerome says,—

[1] Descendisti quidem Filius hominis, nec Patri, cum descenderes, abfuisti: sed descendisti nobis; ut te oculis ac mentibus videremus, ut in te crederemus. Ergo et ascendisti nobis; ut et te sequeremur mentibus, quem oculis videre non possumus. .... Ascendisti et Paulo, qui non contentus solus te sequi, nos quoque docuit quemadmodum te sequamur, et ubi te reperire possimus, dicens, "Si ergo consurrexistis cum Christo, &c." (Col. iii. 1.) Et ne oculorum magis hoc quam animorum putaremus officium, addidit: "Quæ sursum sunt sapite, non quæ super terram." (ib. 2.) Ergo non supra terram, nec in terra, nec secundum carnem te quærere debemus, si volumus invenire: nunc enim secundum carnem jam non novimus Christum. Denique Stephanus non supra terram quæsivit, qui stantem te ad dexteram Dei vidit: Maria autem quia quærebat in terra, tangere non potuit. Stephanus tetigit, quia quæsivit in cœlo; Stephanus inter Judæos vidit absentem: Maria inter angelos non vidit præsentem. AMBROS. Expos. evang. sec. Luc. lib. x. §§ 159, 160. Op. ed. Ben. Par. tom. i. col. 1538.

[2] See p. 266 above.

[3] Ascende ergo, homo, in cœlum, et videbis illa quarum umbra hic erat vel imago. AMBROS. Enarr. in Psalm. 38. § 26. Op. i. 853.

"Let us ascend with our Lord to the great supper-chamber prepared and cleansed, and let us receive from him *above* the cup of the New Testament; and there with him celebrating the Passover, let us be inebriated with the wine of sobriety from him." [1]

Similar language is found in the extracts already given from the works attributed to Dionysius the Areopagite, and the Commentary of Maximus upon them; the latter telling us to observe, that Dionysius "everywhere calls the divine service of the Communion symbolical, and the holy gifts symbols of things that are *above* and more real." [2]

All these passages clearly call upon us to raise our minds up from that which is before us on the table, and fix it on the realities which are in heaven, and of which the image only is before us; and are wholly irreconcilable with the notion that the realities we seek are lying on the table before us on earth, in which case our souls should be confined to that which is on earth.

Hence we may see the invalidity of Archdeacon Wilberforce's argument, that while those who hold that the consecrated elements are symbols of the Body and Blood of Christ, call upon us to look up to heaven in this ordinance, and realize the presence of Christ there, the Fathers invoke the descent of the Holy Spirit upon them, and speak of the Body and Blood of Christ as actually on the table. For we here see, that the Fathers also directed us in the same way to look above. The mistake arises from the Archdeacon not rightly interpreting the meaning of the Fathers in the language they use as to the presence of Christ's Body and Blood on the Table. In the sense they attached to the words, they could freely use them, as they did, without any inconsistency with their exhortations to the people to direct their thoughts to heaven. They viewed the elements as *representatively* and *in operation and effect* the Body and Blood of Christ, and spoke of them as such, freely calling them by the names of those things which they signified. They evidently considered this to be the language which was due to their *character* and *use*, and sanctioned by the example of our Blessed Lord, and

[1] Ascendamus cum Domino cœnaculum magnum, stratum atque mundatum, et accipiamus ab eo sursum calicem Novi Testamenti; ibique cum eo Pascha celebrantes, inebriemur ab eo vino sobrietatis. HIERON. Ep. ad Hedib. ep. 120. c. 2. Op. ed. cit. tom. i. col. 824.

[2] See p. 275 above.

would have considered themselves as failing in the respect due to them, if they had not spoken of them in this way. And such language might have continued to be freely used, if the awful corruption of doctrine that has since taken place had not rendered it dangerous to do so. To a certain extent it is, and may properly be, used now. But not as it was in earlier times.

In the homily of Chrysostom from which we have just quoted, we may see a specimen of the language of the antient Fathers in both these respects. In the passage just quoted, he exhorts us to lift up our hearts to heaven, when partaking of the Eucharist, and not dwell upon what is before us on earth. In the latter part of the same homily, exhorting his hearers in that hyperbolical language in which he delighted, he speaks thus:—

"This mystery makes earth heaven to you. Open therefore the gates of heaven and look through; or rather, not of heaven, but of the heaven of heavens, and then you will see what I speak of. For that which is more precious than all things there, this I will show you lying upon the earth. For as in palaces that which is more glorious than all things is, not the walls, not the roof of gold, but the royal body sitting upon the throne, so also in heaven is the body of the king. But this you may now see upon earth. For I show you not angels, not archangels, nor the heavens and heavens of heavens, but the Lord himself of these. Have you observed how you may see upon earth the most precious of all things? and not only see it, but also touch it? and not only touch it, but also eat it? and having taken it, return home? Therefore purify your soul, prepare your mind for the reception of these mysteries." [1]

Now what the meaning of all this is, the very strength of the expressions used amply shows; and those who are acquainted with Chrysostom's style will find no difficulty in the passage.

[1] Ἐνταῦθα γάρ σοι τὴν γὴν οὐρανὸν ποιεῖ τουτὶ τὸ μυστήριον. Ἀναπέτασον γοῦν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ τὰς πύλας, καὶ διάκυψον· μᾶλλον δὲ οὐχὶ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, ἀλλὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ τῶν οὐρανῶν, καὶ τότε ὄψει τὸ εἰρημένον. τὸ γὰρ πάντων ἐκεῖ τιμιώτερον, τοῦτό σοι ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς δείξω κείμενον. Ὥσπερ γὰρ ἐν τοῖς βασιλείοις τὸ πάντων σεμνότερον, οὐ τοῖχοι, οὐκ ὄροφος χρυσοῦς, ἀλλὰ τὸ βασιλικὸν σῶμα τὸ καθήμενον ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου· οὕτω καὶ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς τὸ τοῦ βασιλέως σῶμα. Ἀλλὰ τοῦτό σοι νῦν ἔξεστιν ἐπὶ γῆς ἰδεῖν. Οὐ γὰρ ἀγγέλους, οὐδὲ ἀρχαγγέλους, οὐδὲ οὐρανοὺς καὶ οὐρανοὺς οὐρανῶν, ἀλλ' αὐτὸν τὸν τούτων σοι δείκνυμι δεσπότην. Εἶδες πῶς τὸ πάντων τιμιώτερον ὁρᾷς ἐπὶ γῆς; καὶ οὐκ ὁρᾷς μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἅπτῃ; καὶ οὐκ ἅπτῃ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐσθίεις; καὶ λαβὼν οἴκαδε ἀναχωρεῖς; ἀπόσμηχε τοίνυν τὴν ψυχὴν, παρασκεύαζε τὴν διάνοιαν πρὸς τὴν τούτων τῶν μυστηρίων ὑποδυχήν. CHRYSOST. In Ep. 1. ad Corinth. hom. xxv. 5. Op. x. 218, 219.

Do the Authors under review themselves maintain, that we "*see*" and "*touch*" the *real body* of Christ? No, they admit fully that it is not the object of our senses. Whether they hold that the bread and wine remain, or only the accidents of the bread and wine, they equally hold that these are all we can *see* or *touch*. Now with Chrysostom that which we *see* and *touch* is the Body of Christ, and *the same thing* is what we eat as the Body of Christ. What he means therefore is that symbolical and representative body, which whosoever eats worthily, is thereby brought into communion with the real body of Christ, and derives from it spiritual life. Understand the phrases in this sense, and all is clear and plain as to his meaning. But if such terms are to be understood literally, we shall find the statements of the Fathers a mass of contradictions.

(18.) *The Fathers tell us, that we eat and drink the body and blood of Christ not only in the Eucharist, but when we read the Holy Scriptures; the body and blood spoken of by our Saviour as to be eaten and drunk by us being the Holy Scriptures; which illustrates their view of the* NATURE *of the act.*

Thus Origen says, in a passage already quoted,[1]—

"We are said to drink the blood of Christ, not only in the rite of Sacraments, but also when we receive his words, in which life consists, as he himself also says; 'The words that I speak are spirit and life.' He therefore is wounded whose blood we drink, that is, we receive the words of his doctrine."

And he expressly states, that the flesh and blood of Christ, which we are exhorted by our Lord to eat and drink, are *his word;* and cautions us against understanding such phrases *literally,* as they are "*figures.*" I have already given several passages from him to this effect, and therefore, as I am unwilling to repeat more than is necessary, I must refer the reader to a previous page for them.[2] But I shall here add one written expressly as a commentary upon the account of the institution of the Eucharist given by St. Matthew:—

"That bread which God the Word witnesses to be his body, is the word that nourishes our souls, the word proceeding from God

[1] See p. 113 above.
[2] See pp. 112, 113, above.

the Word,[1] and bread from the heavenly bread, which is placed upon the table of which it is written, 'Thou hast prepared a table before me against those who trouble me.' And that drink which God the Word witnesses to be his blood is the word that affords drink, and excellently inebriates the hearts of those who drink it,[2] which is in the cup of which it is written, 'And thy inebriating cup, how excellent is it.' And that drink is the produce of the true vine, whose words are, 'I am the true vine.' And it is the blood of that grape which, thrown into the wine-press of the Passion, produced this drink. And so the bread is the word of Christ made from that corn of wheat which, falling into the ground, has brought forth much fruit. For God the Word did not call that visible bread which he held in his hands his body, but the word for a mystery [or, a sacrament] of which that bread was to be broken. Nor did he call that visible drink his blood, but the word for a mystery [or, sacrament] of which that drink was to be poured forth. For the body of God the Word, or his blood, what else can it be but the word which nourishes and the word which cheers the heart?[3] But why did he not say, 'This is the bread of the New Testament,' as he said, 'This is the blood of the New Testament?' Because the bread is the word of righteousness, on eating which souls are nourished; but the drink is the word of the acknowledgment of Christ according to the mystery of his nativity and passion. Since, therefore, the testament of God is constituted with regard to us in the blood of Christ's passion, so that we believing in the Son of God that was born and suffered for us according to the flesh, may be saved, not in righteousness, in which alone without faith in the passion of Christ there could not be salvation, therefore it is said only of the cup: 'This is the cup of the New Testament.'"[4]

[1] Panis iste quem Deus Verbum corpus suum esse fatetur, verbum est nutritorium animarum, verbum de Deo Verbo procedens.

[2] Et potus iste quem Deus Verbum sanguinem suum fatetur, verbum est potans et inebrians præclare corda bibentium.

[3] Non enim panem illum visibilem quem tenebat in manibus, corpus suum dicebat Deus Verbum, sed verbum in cujus mysterio fuerat panis ille frangendus. Nec potum illum visibilem sanguinem suum dicebat, sed verbum in cujus mysterio potus ille fuerat effundendus. Nam corpus Dei Verbi, aut sanguis, quid aliud esse potest, nisi verbum quod nutrit, et verbum quod lætificat cor?

[4] Origen. Comment. Series in Matth. § 85. (al. tract. 35.) In Matth. xxvi. 26 et seq. Op. iii. 898.—The words from "non enim" down to "lætificat cor" appeared for the first time in the Benedictine edition of Origen's works, having been omitted in the previous editions. The Editor admits, that he found them in two antient MSS., *in one of which, however, they had been struck through with a pen* (stylo expuncta). It is well to notice these proofs of the way in which the writings of the Fathers have been tampered with by the Romanists.

Such is the interpretation given by Origen to our Lord's words at his Last Supper, not in the way of allegory, but as the plain meaning of the words. Whether it is the right interpretation or not, I do not now inquire, because our present object is to learn what the Fathers said upon the subject. And Origen's interpretation at least shows, that no such doctrine as that of the Romanists or the Authors under review was established, at the time these words were written, as the received doctrine of the Church.

And so in a work attributed to Jerome it is said, as already quoted in a previous page,[1]—

"When Christ says, 'He that eateth not my flesh and drinketh not my blood,' although it may also be understood sacramentally, yet with greater truth the body of Christ and his blood is the word of the Scriptures, is the divine doctrine."

And thus also Eusebius of Cæsarea on John vi. 62 et seq. says,[2]—

"By which words he instructed them to understand spiritually the words that he had spoken concerning flesh and blood; for you must not consider me to speak of the flesh which I carry about me, as if you were to eat that; nor suppose that I command you to drink sensible and bodily blood. But understand well, that the words that I have spoken to you are spirit and life: so that *his words and discourses are the flesh and blood*, of which he who always partakes, as one fed upon heavenly food, shall be a partaker of heavenly life."

Eusebius's notion of a "spiritual" interpretation of our Lord's words is very different from that of the Authors under review. They tell us, that the carnal and Capernaitical sense is indeed to be rejected, and a spiritual sense to be given to them; but *their spiritual sense* only differs from the Capernaite interpretation by its supposing that the real body is present in the form of a spirit instead of a material form.

Whether Eusebius's interpretation is correct or not, it at any rate shows, that very different notions on the meaning of the

The Benedictine Editor fairly confesses, that these words completely posed him when he came upon them, but flatters himself, that by the help of a M. Robbe, who "alone among many he consulted was able to explain the sense of this intricate allegory," he is able to give them a "*Catholic*," that is, a *Romish* sense. All honor to the ingenuity of M. Robbe, but I cannot spare the room for such attempts at mystification. Our best thanks, however, are due to him; for, but for his exposition, we might never have heard of the passage.

[1] See p. 116 above.

[2] See p. 115 above.

words prevailed in the Church in his time from those maintained by the Authors under review.

Again, in an acknowledged work of Jerome, it is said,—

"Moreover, inasmuch as the flesh of the Lord is the true food, and his blood is the true drink, by legitimate consequence, this is the only good we have in the present world, namely, to feed upon his flesh and drink his blood, *not only in the sacrament, but also in the reading of the Scriptures.* For the true meat and drink, which is taken from the word of God, is the knowledge of the Scriptures." [1]

The force of these passages lies more especially in the way in which the two modes of eating the flesh and drinking the blood of Christ are *coupled together.* We cannot suppose that the writers considered them to be so dissimilar in their nature as the Authors under review would have them to be. The latter admit, as of course they are compelled to do, that the Fathers say, we eat the flesh of Christ and drink his blood in reading the Scriptures, but they contend, that the Fathers give this only as a metaphorical application of our Lord's words, and confine the proper sense of his words to our participation of the Eucharist. But the passages just quoted are entirely opposed to this view. They *connect together* the acts in which it is said that we eat the flesh and drink the blood of Christ in a way that is inconsistent with such a notion, and at least implies a similarity in the mode in which such communion takes place in those acts.

(19.) *The Fathers maintain, that the faithful eat the flesh of Christ, and drink his blood, in Baptism.*

Thus Fulgentius, in a passage already quoted,[2] says,—

"No one of the faithful ought to be anxious respecting those who, although they are rightly baptized, *in a sound state of mind,* yet, through death taking them off suddenly, are not permitted to eat the flesh of the Lord and drink his blood [i. e. in the Eucharist]; on account, namely, of that saying of the Saviour in which he said, 'Unless ye eat the flesh of the Son of man,' &c. For whoever will consider this not merely according to the mysteries of the truth,

[1] Porro, quia caro Domini verus est cibus, et sanguis ejus verus est potus, juxta *αναγωγὴν*, hoc solum habemus in præsenti sæculo bonum, si vescamur carne ejus, et cruore potemur, non solum in mysterio, sed etiam in Scripturarum lectione. Verus enim cibus et potus, qui ex verbo Dei sumitur, scientia Scripturarum est. Hieron. Comment. in Eccles. c. 3. Op. tom. iii. col. 413.

[2] See pp. 291—3 above.

but according to the truth of the mystery, will see at once, *that this took place in the very laver of holy regeneration.* For what is done in the sacrament of holy baptism, but that *believers* are made members of our Lord Jesus Christ, and belong to the communion of his body by ecclesiastical unity? . . . . Wherefore since 'we being many are one bread and one body,' then does each one begin to be a partaker of that one bread, when he begins to be a member of that one body, which, in each of its members, when it is joined in baptism to the head Christ, is then at once truly offered to God a living victim."

And this doctrine, he adds, "we well know that the holy Fathers, without hesitation, believed and taught;" and he proceeds to quote Augustine as a proof, and then adds,—

"I think that my argument is confirmed by the Sermon of the celebrated doctor, Augustine; and that there is no room for any one to doubt, *that each one of the faithful is then made a partaker of the body and blood of the Lord, when in baptism he is made a member of the body of Christ.*"

The passage is so important, that I make no apology for thus repeating a portion of it under this head.

The sermon of Augustine, to which Fulgentius here refers, has been given in full in a former page;[1] and it will be found, on inspection, that it fully bears out the reference thus made to it, stating that the faithful, *before* they participate of the Eucharist, *are* the body of Christ and his members, *insomuch that it is the sacrament of* THEMSELVES *that they receive in the Eucharist.*

To the same effect speaks Cyril of Alexandria. Commenting on the words in Exod. xii. 3, 4, that a lamb was to be taken for a house, or, if the household was too little, the neighbours were to partake of it, he speaks of the benefit sometimes resulting in spiritual things from conference with neighbours, and then refers to the case of the Ethiopian eunuch conferring with Philip, and says,—

"You see how, after conferring with his neighbour (for we are all one another's neighbours, as many of us as have one common rule of faith), he was shown to be already, through this inquiry, a partaker of that lamb which is the object of the mind. For

[1] See pp. 288, 289 above.

he was immediately considered worthy to be baptized, and was baptized." [1]

The words might indeed imply, that he was a partaker of that lamb even before baptism; which, so far as my present subject is concerned, would be equally applicable as a proof of what I am seeking to establish.

Again, on our Lord's anointing the eyes of the blind man (John ix. 6) with clay made with spittle, he says that this had a spiritual meaning, adding,—

"For no otherwise could the nations shake off the blindness that had come over them, and behold the divine and holy light, that is, obtain the knowledge of the holy and consubstantial Trinity, but by being *made partakers of his holy flesh*, and the washing away of the sin that polluted them, and the putting off the power of the devil, *to wit, by holy baptism*. But since our Saviour would impress upon the blind man a type of the mystery [or, sacrament] before its appointment, he in the mean time supplied the place of the power of that participation by the anointing of the spittle. But, nevertheless, for a figure of holy baptism, he orders the blind man to run and wash himself in Siloam."

And he adds, that we, "knowing that *the Son of God himself invisibly floats upon the waters of the holy font*, are washed with faith." [2]

(20.) *The real flesh and blood of Christ are not, according to the Fathers, eaten and drunk orally in the Eucharist.*

Were it not for the inconsistency manifested in the arguments of the Authors under review, there is a class of statements abounding in the Fathers which would be among the first

[1] Ὁρᾷς ὅπως τὸν γείτονα συλλαβών· ἐγγὺς γὰρ ἀλλήλων οἱ πάντες ἐσμὲν, ὅσοι εἰς τὸν ἕνα καὶ κοινὸν τῆς πίστεως λόγον· μέτοχος ἤδη τοῦ νοητοῦ προβάτου διὰ τῆς ἐρεύνης ἀνεδεικνύετο. Ἠξίου γὰρ εὐθὺς καὶ βεβαπτίσθαι, καὶ δὴ καὶ βεβάπτισται. Cyrill. Alex. Glaph. in Exod. lib. ii. Op. i. 270.

[2] Οὐκ ἦν ἑτέρως τὰ ἔθνη δύνασθαι τὴν ἐπισκήψασαν αὐτοῖς ἀποκρούσασθαι τυφλότητα, καὶ τὸ θεῖόν τε καὶ ἅγιον ἐπαθρῆσαι φῶς, τοῦτ' ἔστι, τὴν τῆς ἁγίας καὶ ὁμοουσίου τριάδος γνῶσιν ἀναλαβεῖν, εἰ μὴ γέγονε μέτοχα τῆς ἁγίας αὐτοῦ σαρκός, καὶ ἀπελούσατο τὴν καταμελαίνουσαν ἁμαρτίαν, ἀπεδύσατο δὲ τοῦ διαβόλου τὴν ἐξουσιαν, διὰ τοῦ ἁγίου δηλονότι βαπτίσματος. Ἐπειδαν δὲ πρόωρον τοῦ μυστηρίου τὸν τύπον τῷ τυφλῷ ἐνεχάραττεν ὁ σωτὴρ, ἀπεπλήρου τέως τῆς μετοχῆς τὴν δύναμιν διὰ τῆς ἐπιχρίσεως τοῦ πτύσματος. Εἰς εἰκόνα γε μὴν τοῦ ἁγίου βαπτίσματος τὸ ἐν τῷ Σιλωάμ ἀπονίπτεσθαι δραμόντα κελεύει. . . . . Αὐτόν τε τοῖς ὕδασιν ἀορατως ἐπινήχεσθαι τῆς ἁγίας κολυμβήθρας γινώσκοντες, λουόμεθα μετὰ πίστεως. Id. In Johann. lib. vi. Op. iv. 602.

evidence to be produced in support of the position now to be proved; and which, in fact, will probably be considered by all impartial minds as furnishing satisfactory proof of its truth; I mean those in which it is stated, that the flesh and blood of Christ, as received in the Eucharist, are not the food of the body, but of the mind. For it surely follows, that if a thing is not the food of the body, it is not to be received into the body as bodily food is.

But the testimonies of this kind in the Fathers are so clear and numerous,[1] that, as we have seen,[2] it is admitted by Archdeacon Wilberforce that such is the case. He himself says, that "the process by which Christ's Body and Blood act upon the receiver is spiritual and not physical;" and quotes with approbation the statement, that "the Body of Christ is the food, not of the belly, but of the mind; of the soul and *not the body;*" and admits, that "the Body of Christ which we receive "in this Sacrament . . . . does not and cannot act directly upon "our material structure," and that it works only "through a spiritual process," and "its medium must be a believing heart."

But nevertheless the exigencies of his theory demand, that he should strenuously maintain, that though the flesh and blood of Christ are not present in such a way as to be food for the body, yet that they are received into the body as part of the consecrated sacramental substances. And the proof is of course found in those passages in which the Fathers,—calling, according to their custom, *the signs by the names of the things signified,* —speak of the body and blood of Christ as eaten and drunk by the communicants.

But I may say to *them* what Bishop Bilson (a Tractarian referee) said to *the Romanists,* that, granting (as it must be granted) that "in this sacrament the signs after consecration did carry the names and effects of the things themselves," "then are the places which you brought for the real eating of "Christ's flesh with your mouths and teeth *returned back with-* "*out your conclusion.* For the signs, *which are called after* "*consecration by the names of Christ's body and blood,* do enter

[1] As, for instance, Chrysostom, — *τὴν οὐ σῶμα ἀλλὰ ψυχὴν τρέφουσαν.* In Johann. hom. 44. § i. Op. viii. 260. Non corporalis esca, sed spiritalis. Ambros. vel Pseud.-Ambros. De Myst. c. 9. Op. ii. 341.

[2] See p. 177 above.

" our mouths and pass our throats; the true flesh and blood of " Christ *do not*, but are eaten at the Lord's table only of the " inward man by faithful devotion and affection, preparing the " heart that Christ may lodge there, and dwell there, where he " delighteth; and not in the mouths and jaws of men, which " is no place for him that sitteth in heaven; whither we must " fly with the spiritual wings of our souls and spirits, before " we can be partakers of him." [1]

Putting aside, however, for the present, the argument derived from the passages which show that the signs were called by the names of the things signified, and also that derived from the places which speak of Christ's body and blood as the food *not of the body*, but of the soul, (this being, though inconsistently, admitted by our Authors), I shall proceed to adduce some passages which speak *more directly* to the point in question.

First, let us notice the testimony of Augustine.

In a passage already quoted, he says, that the admonition, " Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man," &c., " seems to " command a crime or a great wickedness; *therefore it is* A " FIGURE, directing us to hold communion with the passion of " our Lord, and sweetly and profitably treasure up in our " memory, that his flesh was crucified and wounded for us." [2]

Augustine does not draw a distinction between the oral manducation of the body of Christ present in its *natural form*, after a *material* manner, and the oral manducation of that body present in a *supernatural* form like *a spirit*, as the Authors under review do. He knows nothing of such a distinction between the forms in which Christ's body appears, and that there is a form of it in which it may be taken into our mouths. He at once pronounces, that the exhortation to eat the body of Christ is *a figurative speech*, denoting a spiritual act of the soul.

And to the same effect he often speaks elsewhere. Thus he says,—

" Therefore the Lord being about to give the Holy Spirit, called himself the bread which came down from heaven, exhorting us to

[1] BILSON, True difference between Christian subjection and unchristian rebellion. Oxf. 1585. 4to. p. 762.

[2] See p. 261 above.

believe in him. For to believe in him, this is to eat the living bread. He who believes, eats it." [1]

"*Why do you prepare,*" he says, "*your teeth and belly? Believe and thou hast eaten.*" [2]

"What is bread from the kingdom of God but he who says, 'I am the living bread which came down from heaven?' *Prepare not your jaws, but your heart.* Herefrom is that supper given to us, Behold we believe in Christ, we take him with faith [*or rather, as others read,* whom we take by faith.]" [3]

No words can more clearly negative the notion that we eat and drink the body and blood of Christ with our mouths.

I will add one more passage from his writings. On the words, "Doth this offend you? What and if ye shall see the Son of man ascend up where he was before?" he says,—

"He hence solves the difficulty which had troubled them. He hence explains that which had offended them. Plainly so, if they would understand. For they thought that he was about to give them his body, but he said that he was about to ascend into heaven, and that he was to ascend whole. 'When ye shall see the Son of man ascend up where he was before,' then certainly ye shall see, that he does not give his body in the way you suppose; certainly ye shall then at least understand, that his grace is not taken by bites (or, mouthfuls)." [4]

The Jews supposed, that our Lord meant that they were orally to eat his flesh. But when he told them that he was about to ascend into heaven, then, says Augustine, he clearly removed

[1] Daturus ergo Dominus Spiritum Sanctum, dixit se panem qui de cœlo descendit, hortans ut credamus in eum. Credere enim in eum, hoc est manducare panem vivum. Qui credit, manducat. AUGUST. In Johann. tract. xxvi. § 1. Op. iii. pt. 2. col. 358.

[2] Ut quid paras dentes et ventrem? Crede et manducasti. ID. ib. tract. xxv. § 12. Ib. col. 354.

[3] Quis est panis de regno Dei, nisi qui dicit, Ego sum panis vivus, qui de cœlo descendi? Noli parare fauces, sed cor. Inde commendata est ista cœna, Ecce credimus in Christum, cum (*Lov.* quem] fide accipimus. ID. Serm. 112. § 5. Op. v. 394.

[4] Hinc solvit quod illos moverat. Hinc asseruit unde fuerant scandalizati. Hinc plane, si intelligerent. Illi enim putabant eum erogaturum corpus suum, ille autem dixit se adscensurum in cœlum, utique integrum. *Cum videritis filium hominis adscendentem ubi erat prius,* certe vel tunc videbitis, quia non eo modo quo putatis erogat corpus suum; certe vel tunc intelligetis, quia gratia ejus non consumitur morsibus. ID. In Johann. Evang. tract. 27. § 3. Op. iii. Pt. 2. col. 364.

this difficulty; for a body which is gone to heaven cannot be eaten by our mouths on earth. When he had ascended, they would understand, that the "grace" to which his words referred was not to be obtained by any oral eating.

Many other passages will be added under the next head, showing how completely Augustine regarded the reception of the Body and Blood of Christ as a spiritual act, an act of faith.

But the author of the work "On the Sacraments," attributed to Ambrose, speaks very clearly on the point. He says,—

"It is not that bread which *goes into the body*, but the bread of eternal life, which supports the substance of our soul." [1]

This passage is given as from Ambrose in the Decree of Gratian,[2] who seems to have been a tolerably impartial collector of passages from the Fathers, and left a somewhat hard task to Glossators and Doctors of after times to reconcile them all to the progressive corruptions of the Church of Rome.

A passage of Athanasius, already quoted above,[3] clearly affirms the same doctrine. Commenting on John vi. 62—64, and observing that the things here spoken "are not carnal, but spiritual," he adds,—

"For to how many men would *his body* be sufficient for meat, that *this* should be the food of the whole world? But he therefore made mention of the ascension of the Son of man into heaven, that he might withdraw them from the contemplation of *the body*, and that they might learn, that *the flesh of which he spoke* was *heavenly food from above*, and *spiritual nourishment* given by him."

This is far more than a repudiation of the notion that our Lord's body was to be eaten in a *material form*. It rejects the idea of a bodily eating of his body in *any form*, and urges the necessity of understanding "the flesh of which he spoke" in a figurative sense, as meaning "*heavenly food from above*," and "spiritual nourishment."

The same doctrine is intimated by Clement of Alexandria, who, when explaining the words "He bound his foal to the vine," (Gen. xlix. 11.) says,—

[1] Non iste panis est, qui vadit in corpus: sed ille panis vitæ æternæ, qui animæ nostræ substantiam fulcit. De Sacram. lib. v. c. 4. Inter AMBROSII Opera. tom. ii. pt. i. col. 378.

[2] GRATIAN. Decret. pt. iii. De Consecr. c. 56. [3] See pp. 114, 115, above.

"Binding this simple and infant people to the Word, whom he allegorically calls a vine. For the vine produces wine, as the Word blood; but both are for drink to man for his health (or, salvation); *the wine for his body, the blood for his spirit.*" [1]

This passage, I would observe, is not spoken particularly of the Eucharist, but refers generally to our drinking the blood of Christ for our soul's health; which may be done independently of the Eucharist.

The testimony of Origen is to the same purpose. A passage already quoted goes far to show this, where he warns us, that there is in the New Testament as well as the Old, "a letter that kills him who does not understand spiritually what is said," adding as an instance, "For if you interpret literally this which is said, 'Except ye eat my flesh and drink my blood,' this letter kills." [2]

Now the *literal* sense of the passage, "This is my body," "This is my blood," and therefore the literal eating of Christ's body and blood, is what the Authors under review strenuously contend for; themselves distinguishing their doctrine from the notion of the Capernaites only by the circumstance that they consider the body literally eaten to be present in a spiritual form, while the Capernaites apparently thought that the body was to be eaten in its material form; and if it is to be eaten by the mouth, the Capernaite notion is the most reasonable of the two.

But this literal eating Origen wholly repudiates.

But there is a passage in his works which is perhaps still clearer. For, observing that Holy Scripture uses terms to describe the acts and properties of the soul similar to those it uses with reference to the acts and members of the body, he says,—

"There is therefore a meat and drink of this material man, which is also called the outer man, suitable to its nature, to wit, that which is corporeal and earthly. And in like manner also there is an appro-

[1] Ἁπλοῦν τοῦτον καὶ νήπιον λαὸν τῷ Λόγῳ προσδήσας, ὃν ἄμπελον ἀλληγορεῖ. φέρει γάρ οἶνον ἡ ἄμπελος, ὡς αἷμα ὁ Λόγος· ἄμφω δὲ ἀνθρώποις ποτὸν εἰς σωτηρίαν· ὁ μὲν οἶνος, τῷ σώματι· τὸ δὲ αἷμα, τῷ πνεύματι. CLEM. ALEX. Pædag. lib. i. c. 5. Op. tom. i. p. 107.

[2] Est et in Novo Testamento litera quæ occidat eum qui non spiritaliter quæ dicuntur adverterit. Si enim secundum literam sequaris hoc ipsum quod dictum est, Nisi manducaveritis carnem meam et biberitis sanguinem meum, occidit hæc litera. ORIGEN. In Levit. hom. vii. § 5. Op. ii. 225. See it more fully p. 113 above.

priate meat of that spiritual man which is called the inner man, as *that living bread which descended from heaven.* . . . Thus therefore in all things there is used a similarity of phrases as it respects both the inward and the outward man: but the property of the things is preserved unmixed to each, and *to that which is corruptible corruptible things are given, and to that which is incorruptible incorruptible things are offered.*" [1]

The body therefore, according to Origen, does not receive that incorruptible food, which is suited only for the soul; and as to the circumstance that the words used respecting the acts of the soul are similar to those used to describe the acts of the body, this Origen tells us is customary in Holy Scripture.

To these we might add, if necessary, the passage which will be fully quoted under a following head[2] from his Commentary on Matthew, in which he expressly says, that no wicked man *can* eat the living bread, Christ; which shows as clearly as words could do, that he held, that that living bread is not eaten by the mouth.

So the author of the Catechetical Lectures ascribed to Cyril of Jerusalem distinctly negatives the oral reception of the *heavenly bread.* For, when writing on the words of the Lord's prayer, "Give us this day our daily (or, as he interprets it, *supersubstantial*) bread," he says,—

"This common bread is not supersubstantial; but that holy bread is supersubstantial, as that which will confirm the substance of the soul. *This bread does not go into the stomach* and out into the draught, but is distributed over thy whole constitution for the benefit of body and soul." [3]

Now if it is "eaten," as alleged, by the mouth, with the

[1] Est ergo materialis hujus hominis, qui et exterior appellatur, cibus potusque naturæ suæ cognatus, corporeus iste scilicet et terrenus. Similiter autem et spiritalis hominis ipsius, qui et interior dicitur, est proprius cibus, ut panis ille vivus qui de cœlo descendit. . . . Sic ergo per omnia similitudo quidem vocabulorum secundum utrumque hominem ponitur: rerum vero proprietas unicuique discreta servatur, et [corruptibili] corruptibilia præbentur, incorruptibili vero incorruptibilia proponuntur. ORIGEN. In Cant. Cantic.; Prolog. Op. iii. 28.

[2] See p. 365 below.

[3] Ὁ ἄρτος οὗτος ὁ κοινὸς οὐκ ἔστιν ἐπιούσιος· ἄρτος δὲ οὗτος ὁ ἅγιος ἐπιούσιός ἐστιν, ἀντὶ τοῦ τὴν οὐσίαν τῆς ψυχῆς καταστησόμενος. Οὗτος ὁ ἄρτος οὐκ εἰς κοιλίαν χωρεῖ καὶ εἰς ἀφεδρῶνα ἐκβάλλεται, ἀλλ' εἰς πᾶσάν σου τὴν σύστασιν ἀναδίδοται, εἰς ὠφέλειαν σώματος καὶ ψυχῆς. AUCT. sub nom. CYRILL. HIEROS. Catech. Mystag. v. § 12. Op. ed. cit. p. 299.

Eucharistic bread, it of course descends into the stomach, because *eating* is *swallowing*, not merely putting into the mouth. And therefore these words are directly opposed to the doctrine of the Authors under review.

That this heavenly bread may be so given, yea united to the believer, that its influence may be felt throughout his whole constitution for the benefit both of body and soul, is what I am far from denying.

There is also a passage of Basil remarkably pertinent to the point we are now considering. Commenting on the words, "his praise shall be ever in my mouth," he says,—"the prophet seems to promise that which cannot be done," on account of the various concerns of life, and "how can the mouth of him who is eating and drinking set forth the praise of God?" to which he adds,—"To this we say, that there is a certain *spiritual mouth* "of the inner man, *by which he is nourished* receiving the Word "of life, which is *the bread that came down from heaven.*"[1] And he proceeds to show how often this "mouth" is spoken of in Holy Scripture.

The distinction is here expressly drawn between the mouth of the body, and the spiritual mouth of the soul; and the heavenly bread is said to be received by the latter as distinguished from the former; which is precisely the position which I am here maintaining.

And in like manner Macarius says, that the kings and prophets of the Old Testament did not know, "that bread and wine were to be offered in the Church, as a type of Christ's flesh and blood, and that those who partake of the visible bread should *eat spiritually* the flesh of the Lord:"[2] where the reception of the flesh of the Lord is evidently spoken of as a *spiritual act, an act of the soul,* distinct from the participation of the visible bread by the mouth of the body.

Many other passages might be added, and some will be found

[1] Πρὸς δὴ τοῦτο λέγομεν, ὅτι ἐστὶ μέν τι καὶ νοητὸν στόμα τοῦ ἔνδον ἀνθρώπου, ᾧ τρέφεται μεταλαμβάνων τοῦ λόγου τῆς ζωῆς, ὃς ἐστιν ἄρτος ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβάς. Basil. Cæsar. Homil. in Psalm. xxxiii. § 1. Op. i. 144.

[2] Καὶ ὅτι ἐν τῇ Ἐκκλησίᾳ προσφέρεται ἄρτος καὶ οἶνος, ἀντίτυπον τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ καὶ αἵματος· καὶ οἱ μεταλαμβάνοντες ἐκ τοῦ φαινομένου ἄρτου, πνευματικῶς τὴν σάρκα τοῦ Κυρίου ἐσθίουσι. Macarii Homil. 27. § 17. Ed. J. G. Prit. Lips. 1714. p. 386.

under the next head which are almost equally applicable to the point now under consideration, but these are sufficient for our purpose.

No doubt there are in the Fathers, as I have already intimated, passages easily to be found which speak of a bodily and oral reception of the Body and Blood of Christ. But when we become acquainted with the phraseology in use among the Fathers, this verbal contradiction will not occasion us any difficulty. We have already had abundant proof what the Fathers meant when they spoke of the sacramental substances as the Body and Blood of Christ; and it may be well perhaps here to remind the reader of a passage already quoted above [1] from Isidore of Seville, in which this matter is set in a very clear light. For while the former part speaks of our receiving *orally* the Body and Blood of Christ, the latter shows what he means by that Body and Blood. He says that they received the communion fasting, in order that "the Lord's Body might enter the mouth of the Christian before other meats," and then immediately proceeds to tell us, why *the bread* is called *the Lord's Body*.

This passage is precisely the key we want to open the meaning of those statements which are adduced from the Fathers in opposition to the position I am here attempting to establish.

(21.) *The Fathers maintain, that the eating and drinking of Christ's Body and Blood by us is an act of the soul through faith.*

I have already shown that the Fathers held, that the eating and drinking of the flesh and blood of Christ in the Eucharist is *not* a *corporal* act, *not* an act of the mouth of *the body*. I now proceed to show, that they considered it to be a purely *spiritual* act, an act of *the soul*, in which faith, as *the mouth of the soul*, feeds on the Body and Blood of Christ as sacrificed for us on the Cross, and we are brought into union and communion with that Body as now living and glorified, and thus made partakers both of the blessings purchased by its immolation and of the life-giving influence which it now possesses.

And as the Authors under review, in order to bring their doctrine into apparent consistency with that of the Fathers, use expressions,—such, for instance, as that the flesh and blood of

[1] See p. 242 above.

Christ are the food not of the body, but of the soul,—which often perplex and bewilder their readers in this part of the subject, let it be observed, that here lies the distinction between the doctrines of the two parties:—The Authors under review maintain, that *all* the communicants eat and drink the *real* body and blood of Christ, but that those only derive *saving benefit* from that eating and drinking who have true faith. The Fathers, while of course they hold that all the communicants eat and drink the *sacramental* body and blood of Christ, (which, according to their *professed* custom of calling the *signs* by the names of *the things signified*, they constantly call *the body and blood of Christ*, hold, that it is *only by faith* that we eat and drink the *real* body and blood of Christ; in a word, that the eating and drinking is itself an act of faith, and that the promised benefit is an invariable consequence of that eating and drinking. Men may eat and drink the *sacramental* body and blood of Christ, and only eat and drink damnation to themselves;—and these are frequently called by the Fathers in sacramental language simply the body and blood of Christ; from which phraseology misconception of their meaning often arises;—but they cannot, according to the Fathers, eat and drink the *real* body and blood of Christ, which is a spiritual act, the act of a true and living faith, without deriving the promised blessing from that act.

The point to be looked to, then,—the test of the Fathers' doctrine in this matter, is this,—Do they represent the *eating and drinking itself* to be an act of faith; or do they represent the province of faith to be, to avail itself of the *previous eating and drinking* of the real body and blood of Christ *by the mouth*, and endeavour to obtain the benefit of it?

No man who investigates impartially the writings of the Fathers can hesitate to say, that *the former* is the case. And the only shadow of defence for the contrary notion is derived from a misapplication of those passages in which (the signs being called by the names of the things signified,) the elements are called, in sacramental language, the body and blood of Christ. Nor let any man say, This is what can be done as well without a participation of the sacrament as with it, inasmuch as faith is, or may be, present as much at other times as in

the reception of the sacrament. For, in the first place, the sacrament is an ordinance of Christ's appointment for the specific purpose of leading our minds to the remembrance of his cross and passion. And moreover, we not only hold, that there is in the sacrament an act of faith on the part of the believer, but that an act of grace is promised on the part of God, whereby, in the faithful reception of the bread and wine, the soul of the communicant is brought into communion with Christ through the influences of the Holy Spirit, and hence probably the invocation of the Holy Spirit's influence upon the elements in the antient Liturgies.

But, to our proof.

First, let us hear Augustine.

He tells us, as we have already observed, that "*to believe in Christ, this is to eat the living bread.* He who believes, eats it."[1]

"Why do you prepare," he asks, "your teeth and belly? *Believe and thou hast eaten.*"[2]

"Prepare not your jaws, but your heart .... *We receive Christ by faith.*"[3]

It is difficult to imagine more direct affirmations that the act of eating the living bread, Christ, is an act of faith. But we may add innumerable passages from him to the same effect.

Thus, commenting on the passage, "The words that I have spoken unto you, they are spirit and they are life," he says,—

"For, brethren, we have said, that in the eating of his flesh and the drinking of his blood the Lord commended to us that we should dwell in him and he in us. But we dwell in him, when we are his members; and he dwells in us, when we are his temple..... The Spirit makes us living members."[4]

And he tells us that our Lord,—

"Explained *the manner* of this impartation and his own gift, *how* he would give his flesh to eat, saying, 'He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me and I in him.' *The sign* that a man *has eaten* [the flesh of Christ] *and drank* [his blood] is

[1] See pp. 330, 331 above. [2] See p. 331 above. [3] See p. 331 above.

[4] Diximus enim fratres hoc Dominum commendasse in manducatione carnis suæ et potatione sanguinis sui, ut in illo maneamus, et ipse in nobis. Manemus autem in illo, cum sumus membra ejus: manet autem ipse in nobis, cum sumus templum ejus.... Spiritus facit viva membra. AUGUSTIN. In Johan. Evang. tract. 27. § 6. Op. Tom. iii. Pt. 2. col. 364, 365.

this, if he abides in Christ and Christ abides in him, if he dwells in Christ and Christ dwells in him, if he cleaves to him so as not to be forsaken of him." [1]

That is, *the test*, whether a man has *eaten the flesh of Christ and drank his blood*, is the state of his heart.

Again, elsewhere he says,—

"Our Lord saying, 'He that eateth my flesh,' &c. (John vi. 57) shows *what it is to eat the flesh of Christ and drink his blood*, not so far as the sacrament is concerned, but *in reality*: for this is to dwell in Christ, that Christ also may dwell in him. For he so spoke this as if he would say, He who does not dwell in me, and in whom I do not dwell, *let him not say or think, that he eats my body or drinks my blood*." [2]

Augustine, it will be observed, does not, like the Authors under review, draw a distinction between worthy and unworthy eating and drinking the body and blood of Christ, and say that a man cannot *worthily* eat and drink who does not dwell in Christ, but that he cannot eat and drink the body and blood of Christ *at all* "in reality," though he may do so "so far as the sacrament is concerned." Men may eat and drink the *sacramental* body and blood *worthily* or *unworthily*, to their *benefit* or to their *condemnation*, but to eat and drink the body and blood of Christ "in reality," is a spiritual act, an act of the soul through faith, which none but a true believer can perform.

This, beyond all reasonable contradiction, is Augustine's argument. And in accordance with this view he continually says, that this heavenly bread is *not the bread of the stomach*, but *of the heart*, and calls for the hunger and thirst of the *inner* man;[3] all which expressions are very inconsistent with such a

[1] Exposuit modum adtributionis hujus et doni sui, dicens, 'Qui manducat carnem meam,' &c. Signum quia manducavit et bibit, hoc est, si manet et manetur, si habitat et inhabitatur, si hæret ut non deseratur. Id. ib. tract. 27. § 1. ib. col. 363.

[2] Denique ipse dicens, 'Qui manducat carnem meam, et bibit sanguinem meum, in me manet, et ego in eo' (Jo. vi. 57), ostendit quid sit non sacramento tenus sed revera corpus Christi manducare, et ejus sanguinem bibere: hoc est enim in Christo manere, ut in illo maneat et Christus. Sic enim hoc dixit, tamquam diceret, Qui non in me manet, et in quo ego non maneo, non se dicat aut existimet manducare corpus meum aut bibere sanguinem meum. August. De Civ. Dei, lib. xxi. c. 25. 4. Op. vii. 489.

[3] Panis iste visibilis stomachum confirmat, ventrem confirmat: est alius panis qui cor confirmat, quia panis est cordis. . . . . Sic accipe de pane, quomodo accipis

notion as that entertained by the Authors under review; but as they profess to admit these phrases into their system, and explain them away so as to reconcile them, as they suppose, with it, I shall not notice them further than to add a few of such passages in the note below.

The consideration of another passage, bearing on this point, which has been already quoted in p. 121 above, I shall reserve for the next head.[1]

But one of the most striking proofs that he held that it is *by faith only* that we eat and drink the real body and blood of Christ, arises from his statement, that the Fathers of the Old Testament ate *the same spiritual meat* and drank *the same spiritual drink* as we do, and he explains *spiritual meat* as *that which is taken by faith,* NOT BY THE BODY. For as Christ had not then assumed flesh, there could be no reception *then* of his real flesh and blood by the mouth, and therefore if our spiritual meat and drink consist of the real flesh and blood of Christ, *in any form,* received by the mouth, their spiritual meat and drink could not be the same as ours.

The passages of Augustine involving this statement are numerous, but I shall confine myself to two or three.

One has been already quoted in a former page,[2] to which I must beg the reader to look back, as the passage is an important one.

Another in the same treatise is as follows:—

"'This is the bread which came down from heaven.' The manna symbolized this bread; the altar of God symbolized this bread. They were sacraments: they were different as it respects the signs: in the thing which is symbolized they are alike. Hear the Apostle, 'I would not have you ignorant, brethren,' he says, 'how that all our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea, and were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea, and

de vino: intus esuri, intus siti. Beati enim qui esuriunt et sitiunt justitiam, quia ipsi saturabuntur Panis ille justitia est, vinum illud justitia est; veritas est; veritas Christus est. Ego sum, inquit, panis vivus, qui de cœlo descendi, et, Ego sum vitis, vos sarmenta. ID. Enarr. in Psalm. ciii. serm. 3. § 14.—Panis iste interioris hominis quærit esuriem: unde alio loco dicit, Beati qui esuriunt et sitiunt justitiam, quoniam ipsi saturabuntur. Justitiam vero nobis esse Christum Paulus Apostolus dicit. ID. In Johann. Evang. tract. 26. § 1. Op. iii. Pt. 2. col. 357.

[1] See p. 355—357 below.

[2] See p. 256 above.

did all eat the same spiritual meat.' *The spiritual* in truth was *the same*, for the corporal was different, because they ate manna, we something else: but the spiritual was *the same as we eat*. But our fathers, not their fathers; to whom we are like, not to whom they were like. And he adds, 'And all drank the same spiritual drink.' They [took] one thing, we another; but so far as regards the visible species, for the thing taken symbolized the same thing as it regards spiritual virtue. For how did they drink the same drink? 'They drank,' he says, 'of that spiritual rock that followed them; but that rock was Christ.' Thence the bread, thence the drink. The rock was Christ in a sign [or, symbolically], the true Christ is in the Word and the flesh..... 'This is,' therefore, 'the bread that came down from heaven, that if any man should eat thereof, he should not die.' But so far as pertains to the virtue of the sacrament, not as it respects the visible sacrament: he who eats internally, not externally; he who eats in heart, not he who presses the sacrament with his teeth."[1]

And again elsewhere, with reference to the same passage,—"They did all eat the same spiritual meat," &c.,—he says,—

"Therefore their meat and drink was the same as ours in mystery; but in signification the same, not in the species: inasmuch as the same Christ was to them symbolized in the rock, to us is manifested in the flesh."[2]

But a still clearer passage in his writings is the following:—

"He says, 'They ate the same spiritual meat.' What means '*the same*,' but that which we also eat? .... It had been sufficient

[1] *Hic est panis qui de cœlo descendit.* Hunc panem significavit manna, hunc panem significavit altare Dei. Sacramenta illa fuerunt: in signis diversa sunt: in re quæ significatur, paria sunt. Apostolum audi: *Nolo enim vos*, inquit, *ignorare fratres*, &c. Spiritalem utique eamdem: nam corporalem alteram, quia illi manna, nos aliud: spiritalem vero, quam nos. Sed patres nostri, non patres illorum; quibus nos similes sumus, non quibus illi similes fuerunt. Et adjungit, *Et omnes eumdem potum spiritalem biberunt.* Aliud illi, aliud nos, sed specie visibili, quod tamen hoc idem significaret virtute spiritali. Quomodo enim eumdem potum? *Bibebant*, inquit, *de spiritali sequente petra: petra autem erat Christus.* Inde panis, inde potus. Petra Christus in signo, verus Christus in Verbo et in carne.... *Hic est*, ergo, *panis de cœlo descendens, ut si quis manducaverit ex ipso, non moriatur.* Sed quod pertinet ad virtutem sacramenti, non quod pertinet ad visibile sacramentum: qui manducat intus, non foris: qui manducat in corde, non qui premit dente. August. In Johann. Evang. (in c. vi. v. 50.) tract. 26. § 12. Op. iii. Pt. 2. col. 361.

[2] Idem itaque in mysterio cibus et potus illorum qui noster, sed significatione idem, non specie: quia idem ipse Christus illis in petra figuratus, nobis in carne manifestatus. Id. Enarr. in Psalm. 77. § 2. Op. iv. col. 610.

to say, that they ate spiritual meat. He says, '*the same*.' I know not how to understand the words *the same*, but as meaning that which we also eat. What then, says somebody, was that manna what I now receive? Then nothing new has now come if it already was before. Therefore the offence of the cross is made void. How, therefore, could it be the same, if he had not added '*spiritual*.' For they who so received that manna as to consider it merely with reference to its satisfying their bodily wants and feeding their belly not their mind, ate nothing of any value; the external act satisfied their need. God fed some, to others he made known something. Such as the former ate the bodily meat, *not the spiritual meat*. Whom therefore does he speak of as our fathers who ate the same spiritual meat? Whom do we think, brethren, except those who were truly our fathers? Nay rather, who, not *were* but, *are* our fathers; for they all live. For thus speaks the Lord to some of those unbelievers, 'Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness, and are dead.' . . . . As therefore he says in this place, 'Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness, and are dead,' for they did not understand what they ate, and therefore not understanding *received nothing but the bodily meat*, so the Apostle says, that our fathers,—not the fathers of the unbelieving, not the fathers of the wicked, who ate and died,—but our fathers, the fathers of the faithful, ate spiritual meat, and therefore the same [with us]. 'Our fathers,' he says, 'ate the same spiritual meat, and drank the same spiritual drink.' For there were those there who understood what they ate: there were those there by whom *Christ was tasted more* IN THE HEART than the manna in the mouth. . . .I would say therefore briefly, Whoever in the manna *understood Christ*, ate the same spiritual meat that we do; but whoever sought only to satisfy hunger from the manna, the fathers of the unbelievers, ate and are dead. So also *the same drink*: 'for the rock was Christ.' Therefore they drank the same drink as we do, but *spiritual;* THAT IS, THAT WHICH IS TAKEN BY FAITH, NOT THAT WHICH IS DRANK BY THE BODY. You have heard that it was the same drink; 'the rock was Christ;' for there was not one Christ then, and another now. That rock indeed was one, and the stone which Jacob placed under his head was another; the lamb slain that the Passover might be eaten, was one, the ram caught in a thicket to be sacrificed when Abraham as commanded spared his son, whom as commanded he had offered, was another; there was one sheep and another, one stone and another, but the same Christ: therefore the same meat, therefore the same drink. . . . . Therefore there is the same meat, the same drink, but *to those who understand and believe. But, to those who did not*

*understand, that was* ONLY MANNA, *that was* ONLY WATER. That meat was for the hungry, that drink for the thirsty; neither one nor the other for the believer; but to the believer they were the same as now. For then Christ was about to come, now Christ has come. 'About to come' and 'has come' are different phrases, but it is the same Christ." [1]

From these passages, the mind of Augustine is clear. The things received by the mouth, both under the Old and the New Testament Dispensations, are in themselves (not in *the effects* connected with their faithful reception, but *in themselves*) only

[1] *Eumdem*, inquit, *cibum spiritalem manducaverunt.* Quid est, *eumdem*, nisi quia eum quem etiam nos? .... Suffecerat ut diceret, cibum spiritalem manducaverunt. *Eumdem*, inquit. Eumdem non invenio quomodo intelligam, nisi eum quem manducamus et nos. Quid ergo, ait aliquis, hoc erat manna illud, quod ego nunc accipio? Ergo nihil modo venit, si ante jam fuit. Ergo evacuatum est scandalum crucis. Quomodo ergo eumdem, nisi quia addidit spiritalem? Nam qui manna illud sic acceperunt, ut tantummodo indigentiæ suæ corporali satisfieri putarent, et ventrem suum pasci, non mentem, nihil magnum manducaverunt; factum satis est eorum indigentiæ. Alios Deus pavit, aliis aliquid nuntiavit. Hi tales cibum corporalem manducaverunt, non cibum spiritalem. Quos ergo dicit patres nostros cibum spiritalem eumdem manducavisse? Quos putamus, fratres, nisi qui vere patres nostri fuerunt? immo patres nostri non fuerunt, sed sunt. Omnes enim illi vivunt. Sic enim quibusdam illis infidelibus dicit Dominus, *Patres vestri manducaverunt manna in eremo, et mortui sunt.* .... Sicut ergo hoc loco dicit, *Patres vestri manducaverunt manna in eremo, et mortui sunt;* non enim intellexerunt quod manducaverunt, itaque non intelligentes, cibum non nisi corporalem acceperunt: sic et Apostolus dicit patres nostros, non patres infidelium, non patres impiorum, manducantes et morientes, sed patres nostros, patres fidelium, spiritalem cibum manducasse, et ideo eumdem. *Patres nostri*, inquit, *eumdem cibum spiritalem manducaverunt, et eumdem potum spiritalem biberunt.* Erant enim ibi qui quod manducabant, intelligebant: erant ibi quibus plus Christus in corde, quam manna in ore sapiebat.... Breviter ergo dixerim, quicumque in manna Christum intellexerunt, eumdem quem nos cibum spiritalem manducaverunt; quicumque autem de manna solam saturitatem quæsierunt, patres infidelium manducaverunt et mortui sunt. Sic etiam eumdem potum: *Petra enim Christus.* Eumdem ergo potum quam nos, sed spiritalem; id est, qui fide capiebatur, non qui corpore hauriebatur. Audistis eumdem potum, *Petra erat Christus:* non enim alter Christus tunc, alter nunc. Altera quidem illa petra, alter lapis quem sibi posuit ad caput Jacob; alter agnus occisus ut manducaretur Pascha, alter aries hærens in vepribus immolandus, quando filio suo pepercit Abraham jussus, quem jussus obtulerat; altera ovis et altera ovis; alter lapis et alter lapis, idem tamen Christus; ideo eumdem cibum, ideo eumdem potum.... Eumdem ergo cibum, eumdem potum, sed intelligentibus et credentibus. Non intelligentibus autem illud solum manna, illa sola aqua; ille cibus esurienti, potus iste sitienti; nec ille, nec iste credenti: credenti autem idem qui nunc. Tunc enim Christus venturus, modo Christus venit. Venturus et venit, diversa verba sunt, sed idem Christus. AUGUST. Serm. 352. De util. pœnit. 2. § 3. Op. v. 951, 952.

signs. And as *the rock was Christ* to the Jews, so "to us that which is placed on the altar of God [that is, *the bread*] is Christ." Sacramentally, and in signification, it "IS *Christ*." And therefore, under both Dispensations, there is spiritual meat for the soul to be *understood* as shadowed forth and symbolized by these external signs, and to be partaken of internally by faith as the mouth of the soul, just as the external signs are outwardly partaken of by the mouth of the body; for, says Augustine, the spiritual meat is "*that which is taken by faith*, NOT THAT WHICH IS TAKEN BY THE BODY." And this spiritual meat is *the same* in both cases; in both cases it is Christ; in the former, Christ as *about to come*—in the latter, Christ as *already come*. And to faith it makes no difference whether Christ is about to come or is already come, because it can feed on him, his body and blood, equally well in one case as in the other. *The spiritual meat and drink received are the same in both cases.*

Can any statement be imagined more thoroughly subversive of the notion of the Authors under review, than this of Augustine?

Such is the testimony of Augustine; more full than that of most of the other Fathers, because of the voluminous nature of the works he has left to us.

I proceed to other Fathers.

The passage quoted under the last head from Clement of Alexandria is equally applicable under this. He says that wine is for drink for the body, the blood of Christ *for the spirit*.[1] And in a passage previously quoted he says, that in the words, "Eat my flesh and drink my blood," our Lord "makes drink an evident symbol of faith and the promise."[2] So Origen, as we have seen in a passage recently quoted,[3] not only says that the living bread is the meat of the inner man, but speaks of the body only as receiving the corruptible food, and the soul only as receiving the incorruptible. The latter indeed clearly follows from the former, for the very expression that anything is the meat of the soul, not of the body, is tantamount to saying that it is not eaten by the body; but as the Authors under review do not admit this, it is necessary to observe, that the expression is followed out by this additional statement.

[1] See p. 333 above. [2] See p. 109 above. [3] See p. 334 above.

And, as I have already mentioned,[1] Origen, in the context of this passage, observes, that Holy Scripture frequently uses terms to describe the acts and properties of the soul similar to those that are used with reference to the acts and members of the body; speaking of meat and drink and eating and drinking, with reference to the soul, just in the same way as it does with reference to the body.

And in another part of his writings he notices this custom of Holy Scripture in more express terms. He says,—

"It is the custom of the Divine Scripture to introduce two men under the same appellation, that is, from the likeness of one to the other to call one after the other, that is, to make use of those things which belong to the outer man as names for the inner man. But what I mean is this. The outer bodily man feeds upon corruptible meats, suitable to it. But there is also a certain meat of the inner man, of which it is said, that 'by every word of God man lives.' There is a cup [or, drink] of the outer man, there is another of the inner. For we drink of the spiritual rock that follows us, and we drink water, 'which,' as Jesus said, 'he who drinks shall never thirst.' There is also a clothing of the outer man, there is also a clothing of the inner man. . . . The outer man has arms, and the inner man also. . . . As therefore according to the outer man it is possible not only to use meats, but also to enjoy delights, and chiefly those who are rich indulge in delights, so also the inner man may not only use meats, but also enjoy delights," &c.

And he then proceeds to speak of the mode in which the inner man enjoys delights from things intellectual and spiritual, and passes on to point out how as the eye, the ear, the taste, the touch delights in certain things, so the mind has similar and correspondent sources of gratification.[2]

Hence when expounding the words, "every one that toucheth the offerings shall be holy" (Lev. vi. 18.), and speaking of the sacrifice of Christ as the antitype of these offerings, he says,—

"If any one shall have touched the flesh of this sacrifice, he is immediately made holy. . . . *This flesh all have touched who from among the nations have believed.* . . . For if any one would touch

[1] See p. 333 above.

[2] Origen. In Psalm. xxxvi. hom. 1. § 4. Op. ii. 658. I do not give the original of this passage, because no question is likely to arise as to the meaning of its phraseology.

the flesh of Jesus in that way of which we have spoken, let him approach to Jesus, as to the Word made flesh, with all faith, with all obedience; he has touched the flesh of the sacrifice and is made holy." [1]

And in a passage which I shall quote under the next head,[2] he speaks of Christ as "spiritual food, which the more it is consumed, the more it increases:" where the expression "spiritual food" is used so that it cannot be explained away by the notion that Christ's body comes to us in a spiritual form.

That the acts of the soul are spoken of in Holy Scripture in the same terms as are used to describe the similar acts of the body, is also noticed by Gregory Nyssen, whose words show how things may be spoken of as *present to the soul, and the subject of the acts of the soul*, which are *not present to the body*. He says,—

"For there is a certain correspondency between the movements and operations of the soul and the bodily organs of sense and feeling; and we learn this from the oracles of the Spirit which are now before us [the book of Canticles]. For wine and milk are judged by the taste. But those things being objects of the mind, there is a power of the soul altogether intellectual and capable of apprehending those things. And a kiss acts through the sense of touch. For the lips touch one another in a kiss. And there is also a touch of the soul, which touches the word, acting through *a certain incorporeal and intellectual contact*. . . . And in like manner the smell of the divine ointments is not the smell of the nostrils, but of a certain intellectual and immaterial faculty drawing to itself the sweet savour of Christ by the drawing of the Spirit." [3]

[1] Hujus sacrificii carnem si quis tetigerit, continuo sanctificatur. . . . Has enim carnes, quas nos exposuimus, tetigerunt omnes, qui ex gentibus crediderunt. . . . Si enim (ut diximus) tangat quis carnem Jesu eo modo quo supra exposuimus, tota fide, omni obedientia accedat ad Jesum, tanquam ad Verbum carnem factum, iste tetigit carnem sacrificii, et sanctificatus est. ORIGEN. In Levit. hom. iv. § 8. Op. ii. 203.

[2] See p. 366 below.

[3] Ἀναλογία γάρ τις ἐστὶ τοῖς ψυχικοῖς κινήμασι καὶ ἐνεργήμασι πρὸς τὰ τοῦ σώματος αἰσθητήρια, καὶ τοῦτο ἐκ τῶν παρόντων μανθάνομεν λογίων τοῦ Πνεύματος. Ὁ γὰρ οἶνός τε καὶ γάλα τῇ γεύσει κρίνεται· νοητῶν δὲ ὄντων ἐκείνων, νοητὴ πάντως καὶ ἡ ἀντιληπτικὴ τούτων τῆς ψυχῆς ἐστι δύναμις. Τὸ δὲ φίλημα διὰ τῆς ἁπτικῆς αἰσθήσεως ἐνεργεῖται. Ἐφάπτεται γὰρ ἀλλήλων τὰ χείλη ἐν τῷ φιλήματι. Ἔστι δέ τις καὶ ἁφὴ τῆς ψυχῆς, ἡ ἅπτομένη τοῦ λόγου, διά τινος ἀσωμάτου καὶ νοητῆς ἐπαφῆς ἐνεργουμένη. . . . . Ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ ἡ τῶν θείων μύρων ὀσμὴ, οὐ μυκτήρων ἐστὶν ὀσμὴ, ἀλλά τινος νοητῆς καὶ ἀΰλου δυνάμεως, τῇ τοῦ πνεύματος ὁλκῇ τὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ συνεφελκομένης εὐωδίαν. GREGOR. NYSS. In Cant. Cantic. hom. 1. Op. ed. Paris. 1615. tom. i. p. 484.

These remarks are very similar to those just quoted from Origen upon the same portion of Holy Scripture; and in Origen, as we have seen, they are connected with an application of them to the point now in question.

The testimony of Chrysostom, as I have pointed out in a former part of this work,[1] is also clearly in favor of the proposition I am now seeking to establish. He expressly urges that our Lord's words as to eating and drinking his body and blood in John vi. are to be understood in a spiritual sense, and that he is speaking there of "the faith that was to be placed on himself." (*τὴν πίστιν τὴν εἰς ἑαυτὸν.*)

The testimony of Athanasius also, as quoted under the preceding head, is equally applicable here, where he says that the flesh spoken of by our Lord was "heavenly food from above and spiritual nourishment." And in the immediate subsequent context he adds, commenting on the words, "For the things which I have spoken to you are spirit and life,"—

"Which is as much as to say, that which is visibly manifested and given for the salvation of the world is the flesh which I carry; but this and its blood shall be given to you for nourishment by me spiritually, so that it may be distributed in each of you spiritually, and be to all a preservation unto the resurrection of everlasting life."[2]

The word "spiritually" here is of course interpreted by those who hold the sentiments of the Authors under review as meaning that the body of Christ comes in the form of a spirit. I leave the reader to judge of this interpretation after a consideration of the whole passage.

The testimonies also of Pseud-Ambrose and Macarius, quoted under the last head,[3] are equally applicable to the point now under consideration; but, to prevent repetition, I content myself with thus referring the reader to them.

That of Basil, as quoted under the last head, is so express that I must here repeat it. "There is," he says, "a certain spiritual

[1] See pp. 100 and 124 above.

[2] *Ἴσον τῷ εἰπεῖν, τὸ μὲν δεικνύμενον καὶ διδόμενον ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου σωτηρίας, ἐστὶν ἡ σὰρξ ἣν ἐγὼ φορῶ. ἀλλ' αὕτη ὑμῖν καὶ τὸ ταύτης αἷμα παρ' ἐμοῦ πνευματικῶς δοθήσεται τροφὴ, ὥστε πνευματικῶς ἐν ἑκάστῳ ταύτην ἀναδίδοσθαι, καὶ γίνεσθαι πᾶσι φυλακτήριον εἰς ἀνάστασιν ζωῆς αἰωνίου.* ATHANAS. Epist. 4 ad Serap. § 19. Op. tom. i. Pt. 2. p. 710.

[3] See pp. 332 and 335 above.

"mouth of the inner man, *by which he is nourished* receiving the "Word of life, which is *the bread that came down from heaven.*" [1]

And further on in the same Homily he says, commenting on the words, "Taste and see how sweet the Lord is,"—

"We have often observed, that the faculties of the soul are called by the same names as the external members of the body. And since our Lord is the true bread and his flesh the true meat, it is necessary that the pleasure and joy derived from that bread should accrue to us through *a mental taste.*" [2]

And in another place he explains the words—"He that eateth me shall live by me" (John vi. 58)—as follows:—

"For we eat his flesh and drink his blood by being made partakers through his incarnation and life of sense of the Word and wisdom. For he called his whole mystical course and conversation on earth his flesh and blood, and signified by them that doctrine consisting of practical and natural and theological teaching by which the soul is nourished and is prepared for the contemplation of things." [3]

I do not quote this passage as fully describing his doctrine, but as showing his notion of the nature of the act described as eating the flesh and drinking the blood of Christ, namely, that it is a spiritual act, an act of the soul.

So again Cyril of Alexandria expressly says, like Augustine, that Christ himself was eaten by the Old Testament Fathers under the figure of the manna. He says that—

"The true manna is Christ himself, understood to be given to those of old time by God the Father by the manna as in a figure." [4]

[1] See p. 335 above.

[2] Πολλαχοῦ τετηρήκαμεν, ὅτι τοῖς ἔξωθεν μέλεσιν ὁμωνύμως αἱ τῆς ψυχῆς προσαγορεύονται δυνάμεις. Ἐπεὶ δὲ ἄρτος ἐστὶν ἀληθινὸς ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν, καὶ ἡ σὰρξ αὐτοῦ ἀληθής ἐστι βρῶσις, ἀνάγκη τὴν ἡδονὴν τῆς εὐφροσύνης τοῦ ἄρτου διὰ γεύσεως ἡμῖν νοητῆς ἐγγίνεσθαι. Basil. Cæs. Hom. in Psalm. xxxiii. § 6. Op. i. 148, 149.

[3] Τρώγομεν γὰρ αὐτοῦ τὴν σάρκα, καὶ πίνομεν αὐτοῦ τὸ αἷμα, κοινωνοὶ γινόμενοι, διὰ τῆς ἐνανθρωπήσεως καὶ τῆς αἰσθητῆς ζωῆς, τοῦ Λόγου καὶ τῆς σοφίας. Σάρκα γὰρ καὶ αἷμα πᾶσαν αὐτοῦ τὴν μυστικὴν ἐπιδημίαν ὠνόμασε, καὶ τὴν ἐκ πρακτικῆς καὶ φυσικῆς καὶ θεολογικῆς συνεστῶσαν διδασκαλίαν ἐδήλωσε, δι' ἧς τρέφεται ψυχὴ, καὶ πρὸς τὴν τῶν ὄντων τέως θεωρίαν παρασκευάζεται. Id. Epist. viii. (al. 141.) § 4. Op. iii. 84.

[4] Ἐπιδείξομεν δὲ διὰ πάντων, ὅτι τὸ μάννα τὸ ἀληθινὸν, αὐτός ἐστιν ὁ Χριστὸς, ὡς ἐν τύπῳ τῷ μάννα χορηγεῖσθαι τοῖς ἀρχαιοτέροις νοούμενος παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρός. Cyrill. Alex. Comment. in Johan. Evang. lib. iii. Op. iv. 312, 313.

Now the human nature of Christ was not then in existence, to be given literally.

And he adds in the context,—

"He therefore verily is that true manna, the bread from heaven, given by God the Father to *every rational creature*." [1]

So also Gregory the Great says, that our Lord "gave himself for meat to *the minds of men*, saying, 'He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me and I in him.'" [2]

To the same effect speaks Vigilius when he says,—

"To believe on the Son of God, this is to see him, this is to hear him, this is to adore him, this is to taste him, this is to handle him." [3]

Where Christ's body is *tasted* and *handled*, it must be *really present;* but the presence is, as the tasting and handling is, only to faith.

I must also add on this head, that the fact that the Fathers considered us as eating the body of Christ *as dead*, and drinking his blood *as shed* upon the Cross, as I have already shown that they did,[4] proves that they held, that this eating and drinking is an act of the soul, an act of faith, for they cannot now be actually present in this condition.

But in the presence of the direct testimonies above-quoted it is not necessary to do more than thus notice this additional argument.

The spiritual nature of the act of eating and drinking the real body and blood of Christ is also clearly recognized by the Fathers, when they tell us, (as we have seen that they do) that we eat and drink that body and blood, when reading the Holy Scriptures. For they apply the words in this case precisely in the same way as they apply them when speaking of the same act as performed in the Eucharistic rite. In both cases they are

[1] Αὐτὸς οὖν ἄρα τὸ μάννα τὸ ἀληθὲς, ὁ ἄρτος ὁ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, ὁ πάσῃ κτίσει λογικῇ παρὰ Θεοῦ Πατρὸς χορηγούμενος. Id. ib. p. 314.

[2] Cibum semetipsum mentibus mortalium præbuit, dicens: Qui comedit carnem meam, et bibit sanguinem meum, in me manet, et ego in eo. Gregor. Magn. Moral. lib. vii. c. 7. (in c. vi. Job. ver. 5.) Op. ed. Ben. Par. tom. i. col. 215.

[3] Credere in Filium Dei, hoc est videre, hoc est audire, hoc est adorare, hoc est gustare, hoc est contrectare eum. Vigil. Taps. Contra Eutych. lib. iv. c. 7. —Inter. Script. Vet. Lat. &c. Tigur. 1571. fol. 103.

[4] See pp. 280—283 above.

speaking of *that* act of which our Saviour spoke in John vi., before the Eucharistic rite was instituted. And as our blessed Lord distinctly annexes spiritual life and indwelling in him to the eating and drinking his flesh and blood there spoken of, it cannot be reasonably contended, that, so far as the real eating and drinking of his true flesh and blood in the Eucharist is concerned, as distinguished from the external or sacramental, the act is of a different kind. For if spiritual life and indwelling in Christ are the result of the former, what more can be produced by the latter, or why should we suppose that it is an act of a different kind?

(22.) *The Fathers assert, that the wicked do not eat and drink the real body and blood of Christ, but only the sacramental or representative body and blood.*

This follows immediately from the evidence given under the last head, for all the proofs that go to show that the eating and drinking of the real body and blood of Christ is a purely spiritual act, an act of the soul through faith, equally show, that the wicked, not performing that act, do not and *cannot* eat and drink the real body and blood of Christ. That they may do so, it is absolutely necessary that the eating and drinking referred to should be an act *of the body*. Consequently all the passages given under the last two heads are strictly applicable as proof of what I am now endeavouring to establish. Some of them indeed, taken from Augustine, expressly and in terms affirm it; two of which I shall repeat here, contenting myself with this general reference to the others.

Let the reader, then, observe these words of Augustine:—

"Our Lord saying, 'He that eateth my flesh,' &c. (John vi. 57.) shows *what it is to eat the flesh of Christ and drink his blood* not so far as the sacrament is concerned, but *in reality*: for this is to dwell in Christ, that Christ also may dwell in him. For he so spoke this as if he would say, He who does not dwell in me, and in whom I do not dwell, LET HIM NOT SAY OR THINK, THAT HE EATS MY BODY OR DRINKS MY BLOOD." [1]

Is it possible to conceive words more expressly affirming the position for which I am contending?

[1] See p. 339 above.

And in the immediate context he says again, speaking of *wicked persons who are in the communion of the Church*:—

"Nor can they be said to eat the body of Christ, since they are not to be reckoned among the members of Christ." [1]

And by referring to the context we shall find, that the position that the wicked do not eat the flesh of Christ and drink his blood in the sacrament was precisely *the* point to which these words were directed; for they are in reply to an argument, that all who received the Eucharist in the Catholic Church must *ultimately* be saved, because in that sacrament they received the flesh and blood of Christ, and our Lord had said, that all who ate his flesh and drank his blood should have everlasting life; to which the answer of Augustine is, that the argument was unfounded, because wicked men, though they received the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ in the Catholic Church, did *not* receive *really* the body and blood of Christ.

And in this passage we see the distinction clearly drawn by Augustine between eating the body of Christ *sacramentally* (sacramento tenus) and eating it *really* (revera), showing that he held, that the *sacramentum* and the *res sacramenti* are not so conjoined that the latter is necessarily eaten with the former, as the Authors under review maintain, but that men might eat the sacrament who did not eat the real body of Christ. The Authors under review, like the Romanists,[2] would fain persuade us, that the sacramental eating and the real eating of the body of Christ are one and the same thing, and that it is impossible for any man to eat the body of Christ *sacramentally* without eating it *really*. Anything more thoroughly opposed to the statements of Augustine could not be conceived. He formally and ex-

[1] Nec isti ergo dicendi sunt manducare corpus Christi; quoniam nec in membris computandi sunt Christi. AUG. De Civ. Dei. xxi. 25. Op. vii. 488.

[2] Si quis dixerit, Christum, in Eucharistia exhibitum, spiritualiter tantum manducari, et non etiam sacramentaliter et realiter, anathema sit. Concil. Trid. Sess. 13. can. 8. The words *sacramentally* and *really* are evidently used here as conjointly and equally referring to the same act, the act of the reception of the elements by the mouth. All agree that Christ is *sacramentally* eaten in the Eucharist, but we deny that a *sacramental* reception includes in itself a *real* reception of the body of Christ. And we assert that the real body of Christ is only eaten in the Eucharist *spiritually*, that is, by an act of faith. This is the position which is *the* point in question between us and the Authors under review, and herein they take the precise ground maintained by the Romanists.

pressly distinguishes between *sacramental* eating and eating *in reality* the body of Christ, as two distinct things which may or may not go together, and the real eating is with him a spiritual act, an act of the soul through faith; so that with him the *spiritual* eating only is the *real* eating of Christ's body.

Any one who will take the trouble of consulting the original will find that the testimony is conclusive as to Augustine's opinion on the subject, and the phraseology of the whole chapter from which it is taken illustrates in the clearest way both the sentiments of Augustine and the language commonly used on the subject. For he first gives an answer to those who promise salvation "to those only who are washed with the baptism of Christ, and *made partakers of his body and blood*,[1] in what manner soever they have lived, and *in whatever heresy or impiety* they may be," and he pronounces them to be in error; and although he here speaks of them as those who have been "partakers of Christ's body and blood," a few lines only further on, he speaks of those who "rightly understand, that he cannot be said to eat the body of Christ who is not in the body of Christ [he means *the Catholic Church*]," showing that in the former words he meant merely that they were partakers of the *sacrament* of Christ's body and blood.

He then takes up the case of those who promise salvation—

"Not to all who have the sacrament of the baptism and body of Christ, but to Catholics only, although living in sin; because, they say, *they* have eaten the body of Christ, *not in a sacrament only, but in reality*, to wit, being members of the body itself;[2] of which body the Apostle says, 'We being many are one bread and one body.' He therefore who is in the unity of his body, that is, in the communion of the members of Christ, the sacrament of which body the faithful communicating at the altar are accustomed to take, he is *truly* to be said to eat the body of Christ and drink his blood.[3] And for the same reason heretics and schismatics who are separated from the unity of this body may partake of *the same sacrament*,[4] but not one that is profitable to them, nay rather that is injurious.

[1] Corporis ejus et sanguinis participes facti.

[2] Quia non solo, inquiunt, sacramento, sed re ipsa manducaverunt corpus Christi, in ipso scilicet ejus corpore constituti.

[3] Ipse vere dicendus est manducare corpus Christi, et bibere sanguinem Christi.

[4] Possunt idem percipere sacramentum.

. . . . . They are not, to wit, in that bond of peace which is expressed by that sacrament."

And he says of these :—

"But again even these, who *rightly understand that he is not to be said to eat the body of Christ, who is not in the body of Christ*,[1] are not right in promising deliverance from the punishment of eternal fire to those who fall from the unity of that body either into heresy, or even into the superstition of the Gentiles."

Here again we see the distinction drawn between one who has "eaten the body of Christ" in the sacrament, and one who may "*truly* be said to eat the body of Christ;" and that those who eat it only in the sacrament, not in reality, yet are said to partake of *the same sacrament* with those who truly eat the body of Christ in the reception of the sacrament.

Augustine then proceeds to the case of those who, though "in the communion of the Catholic Church," are living impure lives (in perditis et damnabilibus moribus), and makes respecting them the remarks quoted above.

Now the only reply which Bellarmine[2] can make to this passage is, that Augustine, in this place, by "the body of Christ" means "the mystical body of Christ," *i. e.* the Church, such being the meaning of those to whom he was replying, who said, "that those could not perish who had received the sacrament "in the true Church, because they had thus not only received "the sacrament of the unity of the faithful, but also eaten the "body of Christ, *i. e.* were incorporated into that unity;" and that Augustine "refuted them on the ground, that the wicked "did not even thus eat the body of Christ, because they cannot "be members of Christ and members of a harlot."

But so far as concerns the visible Church, (which is what Bellarmine refers to) Augustine could not deny, that the wicked were incorporated into it, and *did* in that sense eat the body of Christ. Accordingly to meet this difficulty Bellarmine adds,— "Nevertheless he does not deny, that the wicked are of the body "of Christ, which is the Church, but he denies that they are "*living members* of that body."

[1] Sed rursus etiam isti, qui recte intelligunt, non dicendum esse eum manducare corpus Christi, qui in corpore non est Christi, &c.

[2] See Bellarm. De Euch. i. 13. Op. iii. 453.

But if Bellarmine's explanation is correct, Augustine *does* deny that they are members of the Church of Christ at all, which he could not have done; and therefore Bellarmine's interpretation falls to the ground.

If the Authors under review take refuge in the supposition that Augustine was referring to the invisible Church of true believers, I will only say that I shall be happy to see them occupying such ground, and the matter may then be further discussed between us; though even then the result will be the same.

For, this at least is clear, and is sufficient for our purpose, that whatever Augustine meant by eating the body of Christ, he was speaking of THAT *body of Christ* which *the faithful* receive when partaking of the sacrament, and *that mode* of eating the flesh of Christ and drinking his blood, of which our Lord speaks in John vi. 57; and he denies that wicked men, though in the communion of the Church, do eat that body and drink that blood. He expressly affirms, that the wicked, though receiving the sacrament, do not eat the flesh of Christ and drink his blood; for that our Lord has shown us in John vi. 57, that they cannot do so.

Again, in another place Augustine speaks the same language, observing,—

"*The sacrament* of the Body and Blood of Christ is taken by some to life, by some to destruction; but *the thing itself of which it is a sacrament* is to every man for life, to none for destruction, whosoever may be a partaker of it."[1]

These words of course establish beyond contradiction the fact that Augustine held that the *sacrament* may be partaken of where the *res sacramenti*, "the thing itself of which it is a sacrament," is not partaken of. And, as I have formerly pointed out,[2] all that Archdeacon Wilberforce can say in reply is, that for *res* we must read *virtus*.[3]

[1] See p. 251 above. [2] Ib.

[3] See for other passages pp. 250—254 above, and to those there cited add the following, in which Augustine clearly makes the *sacramentum* and the *res sacramenti* two separate things, of which one may be received without the other. Speaking of the Donatists, he says,—Non quærant Spiritum Sanctum, nisi in Christi corpore, cujus habent foris sacramentum, sed rem ipsam non tenent intus cujus est illud sacramentum, et ideo sibi judicium manducant et bibunt. AUG. Lib. ad Bonifac. seu Ep. 185. § 50. Op. ii. 504.

This is exactly the reply of Cardinal Bellarmine, who tells us that Augustine did not mean by the *res sacramenti*, "*the body of Christ absolutely*, but justifying grace, that is, *the effect* of Christ's flesh spiritually refreshing."[1]

Of course by such explanations we can get anything out of anything.

And so Bellarmine tells us,[2] like the two Archdeacons, that when Augustine distinguishes those who "truly eat the body of Christ" (vere comedere corpus Christi) from others, he means those who eat it *profitably* (utiliter comedunt), as distinguished from those who eat it *without profit*. But the *effect* produced does not alter the fact of eating or not eating. And the slightest examination of the passages will show, that the contrast is between *real* eating and *sacramental* eating; between *truly* eating the body of Christ, or eating the *true* body of Christ, and *sacramentally* eating it, or eating the *sacrament* of it.

Again, he gives us, in another passage quoted under the last head, a distinct *test* to judge by, whether those who have *sacramentally* eaten the body of Christ have also eaten it *in reality*. He says,—

"*The sign* that a man *has eaten* [the flesh of Christ] *and drank* [his blood] is this, if he abides in Christ and Christ abides in him, if he dwells in Christ and Christ dwells in him, if he cleaves to him so as not to be forsaken of him."[3]

There is no possibility of reconciling this with the notion that all who have outwardly eaten the sacrament, and therefore the wicked as well as others, have in that act eaten the flesh of Christ and drank his blood.

But to these passages I must add several others. Thus, writing on John vi. 57, "He that eateth my flesh," &c., Augustine has these words,—

"He explains how that takes place of which he speaks, and *what it is to eat his body and drink his blood*. 'He that eateth my flesh

[1] Non intelligit corpus Christi absolute, sed gratiam justificantem, id est, effectum carnis Christi spiritualiter reficientis. BELLARM. De Euch. i. 13. Op. iii. 452.

[2] ID. ib.

[3] See pp. 338, 339 above. Archdeacon Wilberforce observes (Euch. p. 224, (or) 3rd edit. p. 192.) that the latter words may be translated, "in order that he may not be deserted." Be it so. The argument here maintained is not affected by this.

and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me and I in him.' This therefore is *to eat that food and drink that drink*, to abide in Christ, and to have him abiding in them. And consequently he that dwelleth not in Christ, and in whom Christ dwelleth not, beyond doubt neither eats [spiritually, *is added in the printed editions, without the authority of the MSS.*] his flesh, nor drinks his blood; [although he carnally and visibly press with his teeth the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, *is added as before*]; but rather eats and drinks to his condemnation the sacrament of so great a thing." [1]

Now from what is stated by the Benedictine Editors of Augustine, as mentioned in the note below, it is tolerably clear, that the words in brackets form no part of what Augustine wrote, but were added at a much later period of the Church, and by those who held a different doctrine. An examination of the additions will show at once, that they were made with a view to make the passage *capable of an interpretation* suitable to the then received doctrine. This appears particularly from the insertion of the word "spiritually," for it makes that part of the sentence *open* to a meaning different from the doctrine set forth in the preceding words and in many other parts of the same treatise, and is precisely that which is wanted to enable a

[1] Denique jam exponit quomodo id fiat quod loquitur, et quid sit manducare corpus ejus, et sanguinem bibere. *Qui manducat carnem meam, et bibit meum sanguinem, in me manet, et ego in illo.* Hoc est ergo manducare illam escam, et illum bibere potum, in Christo manere, et illum manentem in se habere. Ac per hoc qui non manet in Christo, et in quo non manet Christus, procul dubio nec manducat [spiritaliter] carnem ejus, nec bibit ejus sanguinem, [licet carnaliter et visibiliter premat dentibus sacramentum corporis et sanguinis Christi:] sed magis tantæ rei sacramentum ad judicium sibi manducat et bibit; [quia immundus præsumsit ad Christi accedere sacramenta, quæ aliquis non digne sumit, nisi qui mundus est: de quibus dicitur, Beati mundo corde, quoniam ipsi Deum videbunt.] *Sicut*, inquit, *misit me vivens Pater*, &c. Aug. In Johan. tract. xxvi. § 18. Op. ed. cit. iii. Pt. 2. col. 362.—The Benedictine Editors add the following note;—"Sic editi quidem: at MSS. nostri omnes habent hoc modo, *nec manducat carnem ejus, nec bibit ejus sanguinem, etiamsi tantæ rei sacramentum ad judicium sibi manducet et bibat. Sicut, inquit, misit me vivens Pater*, &c., carentque verbis ceteris, quæ hic ansulis concluduntur: quæ verba nullo etiam e suis MSS. contineri testantur Lovanienses: habentur ipsa in Bedæ et Alcuini commentariis super Johannem." Ib.—The words within brackets therefore appear to be no part of the passage as written by Augustine, and some of his own words have been altered. Consequently the latter part of the passage, as written by Augustine, stands thus,—"He that dwelleth not in Christ and in whom Christ dwelleth not, beyond doubt neither eats his flesh, nor drinks his blood, although he eat and drink the sacrament of so great a thing to his condemnation."

Romanist to say that the passage is *capable of explanation* according to his views. For a Romanist, while he contends that every communicant eats the true body of Christ, is willing to allow that it may be said, that only the faithful "spiritually" eat it. And accordingly Bellarmine at once fixes upon this word as the foundation for his argument as to the meaning of the passage,[1] not knowing probably that it was not Augustine's. But the express testimony of Augustine, in the previous words and in various other passages, is, that only the faithful eat the body of Christ *at all*. The other additions are harmless, and the words of the whole passage may be, and ought to be, understood in that sense which makes them correspond with the clear testimony of Augustine in other parts of the same treatise. The passage, therefore, even as it stands in the garbled form, when compared with the rest of the treatise from which it is taken, would lead any reader to see the real views of Augustine on the point in question; but, of course, those who garbled the passage have availed themselves of the argument deducible from the introduction of the word "spiritually," and interpret the other words according to their own views. Hence, as has been stated with great exultation by the two Archdeacons, the passage in its garbled state has been inserted in the Romish Service for Corpus Christi day. Respecting this I shall only say, that the alteration and the insertion of it in that Service are both very characteristic of the mode of dealing with the Fathers adopted by the Church of Rome. Respecting the insertion of some of the words in our 29th Article, I shall have to speak hereafter.

Here, however, I am concerned with Augustine only; and as both the Archdeacons (eager to get a supposed argument against Article XXIX.) contend that the words in brackets are not Augustine's, (and in that I agree with them,) I suppose we may conclude, that the passage is to stand here denuded of these additions; and I ask the reader whether we could wish for a passage more expressly limiting the *eating*—not merely the *worthy* eating, or the *spiritual* eating, but THE EATING AT ALL—of the body of Christ to those that dwell in Christ, and in whom Christ dwells?

And it must be added, that in the Book of Sentences from

[1] BELLARM. De Euchar. i. 13.

Augustine compiled by Prosper, we find one exactly corresponding to the above passage, denuded of the words in brackets, although, as usual, the *exact* words are not retained. The Sentence is as follows:—

"He who is discordant from Christ neither eats his flesh, nor drinks his blood, although he may daily invariably receive the sacrament of so great a thing to the condemnation of his own presumption." [1]

We have, therefore, the additional testimony of Prosper, that Augustine thus clearly maintained the doctrine here contended for.

But in fact this doctrine is constantly asserted in the clearest terms by Augustine.

Thus, he says,—

"He therefore that does not eat his [Christ's] flesh, nor drink his blood, hath not life in himself; and *he who eats his flesh and drinks his blood hath life.*"

And then proceeding to remark that a man may take bodily food, and yet not preserve his life thereby, he adds,—

"But in this meat and drink, that is, the body and blood of the Lord, it is not so. For both he who does not take it, has not life, and *he who takes it has life, and that eternal.*" [2]

Again, in the same treatise, drawing a distinction between what Judas ate and what the other disciples ate at the Last Supper, he says,—

"They [*i. e.* the Apostles] ate the bread [which is] the Lord, he [*i. e.* Judas] the bread of the Lord against the Lord. They ate life, he punishment. For he that eateth unworthily, says the Apostle, eateth damnation to himself." [3]

[1] Qui discordat a Christo, nec carnem ejus manducat, nec sanguinem bibit; etiam si tantæ rei sacramentum ad judicium suæ præsumptionis quotidie indifferenter accipiat. AUG. ut cit. in PROSPER. AQUIT. Liber Sentent. ex Augustino, sent. 343. ed. Sirmond. col. 596, or, in August. Oper. ed. Ben. tom. x. Append.

[2] Qui ergo non manducat ejus carnem, nec bibit ejus sanguinem, non habet in se vitam; et qui manducat ejus carnem, et bibit ejus sanguinem habet vitam. . . . . In hoc vero cibo et potu, id est, corpore et sanguine Domini, non ita est. Nam et qui eam non sumit, non habet vitam; et qui eam sumit, habet vitam, et hanc utique æternam. AUGUST. In Johan. tract. xxvi. § 15. Op. iii. Pt. 2. c. 362.

[3] Illi manducabant panem Dominum, ille panem Domini contra Dominum: illi vitam, ille pœnam. Qui enim manducat indigne, ait Apostolus, judicium sibi manducat. ID. ib. tract. lix. § 1. ib. c. 482.

And from this passage we may see that Augustine gave no such interpretation to the words of the Apostle he here quotes as that upon which the Authors under review insist.

Again, he says, speaking of our eating and drinking the body and blood of Christ,—

"That eating is, to be refreshed, and you shall so be refreshed, that that from which you have been refreshed does not fail. That drinking, what is it but life? Eat life, drink life; you shall have life, and the life remains whole."[1]

All these passages clearly and expressly limit the eating the flesh of Christ and drinking his blood to true believers, excluding the notion that the wicked can do so. And the negative is so express and direct and unqualified, that it cannot be reasonably explained away.

But it will be said, Augustine in other passages seems to speak as if the wicked ate and drank the Body and Blood of Christ as well as true believers. Of course he does so. But what has he himself told us on this point? Has he not expressly stated that sacraments are called by the name of those things which they represent?[2] Have not many other Fathers told us precisely the same? Have they not told us, that what is called the Lord's body in the Eucharist is bread, and what is called his blood is wine;[3] and given us *reasons* why the bread in the Eucharist is *called* Christ's body and the wine his blood;[4] and expressly stated that it was customary to call *the signs* in the Eucharist, as in other cases, *by the names of the things signified by them?*[5]

But of all this (which explains the apparent discrepancy at once), the Authors under review, if acquainted with it, take good care not to give a hint to their readers.

Here, however, we find at once the meaning of such passages as speak of the wicked as eating the body and drinking the blood of Christ. According to the custom of the Fathers of speaking of the signs *by the names of the things signified*, it

[1] Illud manducare, refici est: sed sic reficeris, ut non deficiat unde reficeris. Illud bibere, quid est, nisi vivere? Manduca vitam, bibe vitam; habebis vitam, et integra est vita. AUGUST. Serm. 131. (al. 2. De verb. Apost.) § 1. Op. v. 446, 447.

[2] See pp. 241, 242, and 247, 248 above.

[3] See pp. 237—240 above.

[4] See pp. 241—243 above.

[5] See pp. 247—249 above.

follows *of necessity*, that, the elements being called the body and blood of Christ, the wicked should be frequently spoken of as partaking of that body and blood. But no such explanation can be given of the passages that distinctly deny that the wicked can truly eat and drink the body and blood of Christ. We must therefore either suppose that Augustine directly contradicted himself in a most important point, or that he varied in his opinion on the subject, or that the passages are to be accounted for in the way suggested.

But let us examine them.

Archdeacon Wilberforce refers to five passages in the writings of Augustine, as showing that he held that the wicked eat the flesh and drink the blood of Christ, not only sacramentally but really; namely, the following:—Epist. cxl. 66. In Johan. tract. xxvii. 11. Serm. lxxi. 17, and cclxvi. 7. De Bapt. contra Donat. v. 9.[1] Let us consider each of them separately.

It is alleged, that he says of the rich and proud that—

"They are brought to the table of Christ, and receive of his body and blood; but they worship [or, adore] only, and are not also filled, because they do not imitate."[2]

Here certainly there can be no difficulty, when we recollect Augustine's statement as to the signs being called by the names of the things signified by them.

And it is not said, as Bellarmine alleges,[3] that they *adore* the consecrated elements or substances.

Archdeacon Wilberforce also refers to the following passage,—

"Let all this therefore prevail with us, that we do not eat the flesh of Christ and the blood of Christ in a sacrament [or, sacramentally] only, which many wicked persons also do; but let us eat and drink so as to partake of the Spirit, that we may dwell in the body of the Lord as members," &c.[4]

[1] See Wilb. On Eucharist, pp. 119, *note*, 225 and 309, (or,) 3rd ed. pp. 101, 192, and 266.

[2] Ipsi quippe adducti sunt ad mensam Christi, et accipiunt de corpore et sanguine ejus: sed adorant tantum, non etiam saturantur; quoniam non imitantur. Aug. Lib. ad Honorat. seu Epist. cxl. c. 28, or, § 66. Op. ii. 339.

[3] De Euch. i. 13.

[4] Hoc ergo totum ad hoc nobis valeat, dilectissimi, ut carnem Christi et sanguinem Christi non edamus tantum in sacramento, quod et multi mali; sed usque ad Spiritus participationem manducemus et bibamus, &c. Id. In Johan. tract. 27. § 11. Op. ii. Pt. 3. c. 366.

But as no one denies that the wicked eat and drink the body and blood of Christ sacramentally, I see not how the Archdeacon can raise any argument at all out of this passage. It says nothing but what all admit.

The two next passages referred to by Archdeacon Wilberforce are from sermons attributed to Augustine. Now let it be observed, that *all* the passages quoted above, (with one exception,) and which speak so clearly and expressly in favor of the doctrine for which I am here contending, are from two works of Augustine, the genuineness of which is beyond all doubt or dispute; while the case as regards the sermons attributed to him is totally different. The Benedictine Editors themselves have pronounced many to be spurious *which are found in the same collections with those that they have admitted as genuine.* The consequence is, that it is a matter of criticism, not of history, which are his and which are not; and therefore the statements of these sermons cannot stand for a moment against the express statements of such works as that on the Gospel of John and the City of God. The first sermon referred to is from a collection of sermons, entitled, "Sermones de Verbis Domini," attributed to Augustine, of which, with two other collections on other subjects, also attributed to Augustine, the Benedictine Editors admit,[1] that there is not one of the three which does not contain spurious sermons, and therefore the genuineness of each one in those collections must be tested by other evidence. The second sermon referred to is one of eleven which the Jesuit Father Sirmond found in a Carthusian MS., under the name of Augustine. But it is obvious that such a sermon cannot have the slightest authority in determining such a point as that before us. The extent to which sermons have been manufactured under the name of Augustine may be judged (without going into the matter) by the fact, that in one collection of 256 sermons, published as his, the Benedictine Editors admit, that "hardly any one will affirm that sixty are genuine."[2]

The first passage is this:—

"That also which he says, 'He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me and I in him,'—how are we to understand

[1] See Aug. Op. ed. Ben. tom. v. Præf. p. 2. [2] Ib.

it? Can we here suppose those to be meant, of whom the Apostle says, that they eat and drink damnation to themselves, when they eat that very flesh and drink that very blood?[1] Or did Judas, the seller and impious betrayer of his Master, although he ate and drank, as Luke the Evangelist clearly declares, the very first sacrament of his body and blood, made with his hands,[2] with the rest of the disciples, dwell in Christ, or Christ in him? Many finally, who either with a false heart eat that flesh and drink that blood, or after they have eaten and drank, become apostates, do they dwell in Christ, or Christ in them? But truly there is a certain way of eating that flesh and drinking that blood, in which he who has eaten and drank dwells in Christ, and Christ in him. It is not, therefore, that he who in any way whatsoever shall have eaten the flesh of Christ and drank the blood of Christ, dwells in Christ and Christ in him, but he who in a certain way does so; which way truly he had in his eye when he uttered those words.[3] So therefore in that also which he says, 'He who has blasphemed against the Holy Ghost shall never be forgiven;' it is not he who has blasphemed in any way who is guilty of this unpardonable sin, but he who has done so in a certain way."[4]

Now either this language is to be understood as speaking of the sacramental body and blood of Christ, which Augustine himself tells us is commonly called the body and blood of Christ,—the signs taking the names of the things signified by them,—or it is directly opposed to the clear and express statements of his genuine works as quoted above. The Archdeacon may take his choice between the two hypotheses.

My own opinion is, that it is sacramental language, which the Fathers generally used in addressing the people, with a view no doubt of deepening their reverence for those sacred rites, but to the peril, as I think time has proved, of sound doctrine. And it should be observed, that in one part he uses the term "*sacrament* of the body and blood of Christ." And Augustine's argument stands equally good on this supposition,

[1] Cum ipsam carnem manducent, et ipsum sanguinem bibant.

[2] Primum ipsum manibus ejus confectum sacramentum carnis et sanguinis ejus.

[3] Sed profecto est quidam modus manducandi illam carnem, et bibendi illum sanguinem, quo modo qui manducaverit et biberit, in Christo manet, et Christus in eo. Non ergo quocumque modo quisquam manducaverit carnem Christi, et biberit sanguinem Christi, manet in Christo, et in illo Christus; sed certo quodam modo, quem modum utique ipse videbat, quando illa dicebat.

[4] AUGUST. Serm. lxxi. (al. xi. De verb. Dom.) § 17. Op. v. 274.

for he uses the case as an illustration of the different ways of sinning against the Holy Ghost, observing, that, in a way, and to a certain extent, all are guilty of this sin, but that the sin referred to is the direct sin of continued and final impenitence. The illustration, therefore, holds perfectly good, supposing the language to be sacramental language.

The other passage, from Sermon 266, is this:—

"They who eat unworthily, eat and drink damnation to themselves. Because they eat unworthily, do they not eat? Christ gave the sop to the unworthy Judas, and he received it to condemnation. Did he receive it from one who was wicked? Did he receive what was evil? On the contrary, he is on that account guilty, because he received as a wicked man what was good from a good man. . . . . Woe to the men that receive wickedly what is good." [1]

Now in this passage there is not one word to support the doctrine of the Authors under review. There is no question that they who eat and drink the sacrament of Christ's body and blood unworthily, eat and drink damnation to themselves; and that Judas and all who have ever since received the sacrament of the Lord's Supper with like feelings, have received what was in itself good, and the reception of which in the case of the worthy receiver is connected with the bestowal of the best blessings, and have brought a woe upon themselves by receiving it with a wicked mind. But what then? What has this to do with the doctrine here opposed?

There remains but one passage more to be examined, which, with its context, is as follows. Speaking of those who have been baptized either among heretics who do not belong to the Catholic Church, or while in a state of sin, (for he puts the two cases together), he says, that in such cases "the sacrament of baptism is not evil or null in the baptized," and then he adds the following remarks:—

"For as Judas, to whom the Lord gave the sop, gave place in himself to the devil, not by receiving what was evil, but by re-

[1] Qui manducant indigne, judicium sibi manducant et bibunt. Quia manducant indigne, non manducant? Indigno buccellam Christus Judæ dedit, et ille hanc ad judicium accepit. Numquid a malo accepit? numquid malum accepit? Sed ideo reus est, quia a bono bonum malus accepit. . . . . Væ hominibus bonum male accipientibus. Id. Serm. cclxvi. § 7. Op. v. 758.

ceiving in an evil way, so whoever takes the sacrament of the Lord unworthily does not cause it to be evil on account of his being evil, or that because he does not receive to salvation, therefore he has received nothing. For it was none the less the body of the Lord and the blood of the Lord even to those to whom the Apostle said, 'He that eateth unworthily eateth and drinketh damnation to himself.' *Let not, therefore, the heretics seek in the Catholic Church that which they have, but that which they have not*, that is, the end of the precept, without which many holy things may be had, but cannot profit. But the end of the precept is 'charity out of a pure heart,' &c."[1]

Now, viewing the passage as a whole, and comparing it with the statements of Augustine in other works of his of indubitable genuineness, instead of just confining our view to the little scrap quoted by the Archdeacon, we see at once that it will not bear out the argument raised upon it. For Augustine expressly maintains elsewhere,[2] that neither heretics nor wicked men can "*truly*" be said to eat the body of Christ, although there as here he speaks of them as, in sacramental language, eating and drinking the body and blood of Christ. Both receive what is in itself good and salutary, and is *sacramentally* to all equally the body and blood of Christ, representing them, and in the case of faithful recipients instrumentally imparting them, but in other cases bringing the condemnation due to those who despise what they represent. And so far as concerns heretics in a state of separation from the Church, the Authors under review would, I suppose, admit, that Augustine's doctrine (like their own) was, that they did *not* receive the real body of Christ, their consecration of the Eucharist not being "valid." But Augustine here classes the case of heretics with that of wicked men, and speaks of both cases in the same terms.

And the mention made of the case of Judas still further

[1] Sicut enim Judas, cui buccellam tradidit Dominus, non malum accipiendo, sed male accipiendo locum in se diabolo præbuit; sic indigne quisque sumens Dominicum sacramentum non efficit, ut quia ipse malus est, malum sit, aut quia non ad salutem accipit, nihil acceperit. Corpus enim Domini et sanguis Domini nihilo minus erat etiam illis quibus dicebat Apostolus, Qui manducat indigne, judicium sibi manducat et bibit. Non ergo quærant in Catholica hæretici quod habent, sed quod non habent, id est finem præcepti, sine quo multa sancta haberi possunt, sed prodesse non possunt. Finis autem præcepti est caritas de corde puro, &c. AUGUST. De bapt. contra Donat. lib. v. c. 8. (or) § 9. Op. ix. 98, 99.

[2] See pp. 352, 353 above.

shows the real meaning of Augustine; for, as we have already seen,[1] he elsewhere makes a distinction between what Judas ate and what the other disciples ate, saying that "*they* ate the bread [which is] the Lord, *he* the bread of the Lord against the Lord."

The inferences, therefore, of the Authors under review from such passages are totally unfounded, and arise from their inattention (from whatever cause) to the fact, that the Fathers constantly speak of the signs *by the names of the things signified by them.*

I pass on to Origen.

Origen, speaking of what is eaten in the Eucharist, which he says is called "the bread of the Lord," and remarking that it profits the receiver only "when he partakes of *the bread* with an unpolluted mind and a pure conscience," adds the following words:—

"But if everything that entereth into the mouth goeth into the belly and is cast out into the draught, even the food that has been sanctified by the word of God and prayer, as far as concerns that which is material, goeth into the belly and is cast out into the draught; but so far as concerns the prayer connected with it, according to the proportion of faith, it is profitable, and causes the mind to discern clearly and see what is profitable; and it is not the matter of the bread, but the word spoken over it, that profits him who eats it not unworthily of the Lord. And thus much concerning *the typical and symbolical body.* But many things might be said concerning the Word himself, who became flesh, and true food, which he who eats shall altogether live for ever, NO WICKED PERSON BEING ABLE TO EAT OF IT. *For if it were possible that one still remaining wicked could eat him who became flesh, being the Word and the Living Bread, it would not have been written, that every one that eateth this bread shall live for ever.*" [2]

[1] See p. 358 above.

[2] Ἐπειδὰν ἀμιάντῳ τῷ νῷ, καὶ καθαρᾷ τῇ συνειδήσει μεταλαμβάνῃ τοῦ ἄρτου.... Εἰ δὲ πᾶν τὸ εἰσπορευόμενον εἰς τὸ στόμα, εἰς κοιλίαν χωρεῖ, καὶ εἰς ἀφεδρῶνα ἐκβάλλεται, καὶ τὸ ἁγιαζόμενον βρῶμα διὰ λόγου τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἐντεύξεως, κατ' αὐτὸ μὲν τὸ ὑλικὸν εἰς τὴν κοιλίαν χωρεῖ, καὶ εἰς ἀφεδρῶνα ἐκβάλλεται· κατὰ δὲ τὴν ἐπιγενομένην αὐτῷ εὐχὴν, κατὰ τὴν ἀναλογίαν τῆς πίστεως, ὠφέλιμον γίνεται, καὶ τῆς τοῦ νοῦ αἴτιον διαβλέψεως, ὁρῶντος ἐπὶ τὸ ὠφελοῦν· καὶ οὐχ ἡ ὕλη τοῦ ἄρτου, ἀλλ' ὁ ἐπ' αὐτῷ εἰρημένος λόγος ἐστὶν ὁ ὠφελῶν τὸν μὴ ἀναξίως τοῦ Κυρίου ἐσθίοντα αὐτόν· Καὶ ταῦτα μὲν περὶ τοῦ τυπικοῦ καὶ συμβολικοῦ σώματος· πολλὰ δ' ἂν καὶ περὶ αὐτοῦ λέγοιτο τοῦ λόγου, ὃς γέγονε σὰρξ, καὶ ἀληθινὴ βρῶσις, ἣν τινα ὁ φαγὼν πάντως

This passage surely needs no comment.

Again he says,—

"He who is still nourished with that bread [*i. e.* such as the manna was] may reasonably suffer death, but he who has come to the bread that came after it, [he means, the living bread, Christ], and has eaten it, shall live for ever." [1]

Again,—

"No wicked soul can eat the holy flesh of the Word of God." [2]

Again, comparing Christ to the first-fruits offered under the Law, and observing that they were consumed in the ordinary way, he adds,—

"But he who has eaten *those* first-fruits [namely, Christ], and tasted the bread that came down from heaven, shall not die, but last to eternal life. For that is bread which, while it is always eaten, always remains, nay, is always increasing. It is, therefore, as the Apostle says, spiritual food, which by how much the more it is consumed, by so much the more it increases." [3]

And again,—

"We ought to understand, that they who are occupied with feastings and earthly cares . . . . do not celebrate the passover with Jesus, nor receive the bread of benediction from him, nor the cup of the New Testament." [4]

But, says Archdeacon Wilberforce,—"Origen [speaking of

*ζήσεται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, οὐδενὸς δυναμένου φαύλου ἐσθίειν αὐτήν· εἰ γὰρ οἷόν τε ἦν ἔτι φαῦλον μένοντα ἐσθίειν τὸν γενόμενον σάρκα, λόγον ὄντα, καὶ ἄρτον ζῶντα, οὐκ ἂν ἐγέγραπτο, ὅτι πᾶς ὁ φαγὼν τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον ζήσεται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.* ORIGEN. Comment. in Matth. tom. xi. § 14. Op. ed. Bened. Paris. tom. iii. pp. 499, 500.

[1] *Διόπερ ὁ μὲν ἐκείνῳ ἔτι παιδευόμενος τῷ ἄρτῳ, τῷ λόγῳ θάνατον δέξασθαι δύναται· ὁ δὲ φθάσας ἐπὶ τὸν μετ' ἐκείνον ἄρτον φαγὼν αὐτὸν, ζήσεται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.* ID. Comment. in Joann. tom. vi. § 26. Op. iv. 145.

[2] Nulla . . . . dissoluta anima poterit edere carnes sanctas verbi Dei. ID. In Levit. hom. iv. § 8. Op. ii. 203.

[3] Istas autem primitias qui manducaverit, et gustaverit panem qui de cœlo descendit, non morietur, sed permanet in vitam æternam. Iste est enim panis, qui cum semper comedatur, semper permanet, imo semper augetur. Est ergo, sicut Apostolus dicit, spiritalis esca, quæ quanto magis insumitur, tanto amplius crescit. ID. In Num. hom. xi. § 6. Op. ii. 309.

[4] Scire tamen debemus quoniam qui in epulationibus et sollicitudinibus sæcularibus sunt . . . . nec celebrant cum Jesu pascha, nec accipiunt panem benedictionis ab eo, nec calicem Novi Testamenti. ID. Comm. Ser. in Matth. § 80. (al. tract. 35.) Op. iii. 896.

wicked persons] says, 'You do not fear to approach to the Eucharist, and to partake of *the Body of Christ*, as if you were pure and clean.' (In Psalm. hom. ii. 6. vol. ii. p. 688)."

No doubt he does. No one denies that the Fathers constantly spoke of the consecrated elements as the Body and Blood of Christ. The Archdeacon may take that for granted. *The question is, What they meant in using such language.* In the present state of ecclesiastical learning in our Church the Archdeacon may mislead multitudes of the clergy as well as laity by such superficial arguments, but he cannot suppose that men who have any acquaintance with the writings of the Fathers can be influenced by arguments which evade the very thing to be proved.

I pass on to Ambrose.

Ambrose, commenting upon the blessing pronounced on Asher, (Gen. xlix. 20.) compares the bread there mentioned to the Eucharistic bread. "We may also," he says, "understand it of the Lord himself, who gave his flesh for us, as he himself says, 'I am the bread of life,' &c.;" and who, he observes, promised, "If any one eat of this bread, he shall live for ever;" and then he adds these words,—

"For he receives it, who proves himself: but he who receives it, shall not die the death of the sinner, because this bread is the remission of sins." [1]

Again he says, speaking of Christ as *the living bread* spoken of in John vi.,—

"Why do you ask him, O Jew, to give you the bread which he gives to all, gives daily, gives always? It is in your own power to receive this bread; come to this bread and you shall receive it. . . . He is the bread of life; he therefore who eats life cannot die. For how shall he die whose food is life?" [2]

Again elsewhere he says,—

"Therefore every soul which receives that bread that came down from heaven, is the abode of the bread, that is, the bread Christ;

[1] Ille enim accipit, qui seipsum probat: qui autem accipit, non morietur peccatoris morte, quia panis hic remissio peccatorum est. AMBROS. De Benedict. Patriarch. c. 9. Op. i. 525.

[2] Quid petis, Judæe, ut tribuat tibi panem, quem dat omnibus, dat quotidie, dat semper? In te ipso est, ut accipias hunc panem: accede ad hunc panem, et accipies eum. . . . Hic est panis vitæ: qui ergo vitam manducat, mori non potest. Quomodo enim morietur, cui cibus vita est? ID. In Psalm. cxviii. Serm. 18. § 28. Op. i. 1203.

and it is nourished by the strength of the heavenly bread dwelling in it, and confirmed in heart. Hence also Paul says, 'We all are one bread.'" [1]

Now I can conceive of but one objection to these passages, namely, that they do not directly refer to the Eucharist. But they refer to that eating of Christ as the bread of life for the promotion of which the Eucharist was established. And they show that Christ may be eaten as the bread of life apart from the Eucharist, and that the act is a spiritual act, an act of the soul; and if it is so apart from the Eucharist, is it not so also *in* the Eucharistic rite? There are not *two* modes of truly eating Christ as the living bread.

But I will add one more passage occurring in the midst of remarks on the Eucharist in a treatise of which Ambrose is commonly considered the author. Speaking of our having better sacraments than those of the Old Testament Church, he says,—

"They who ate that bread [i. e. the manna] all died in the wilderness: but that meat which you receive, that living bread which came down from heaven, ministers the substance of eternal life; *and whoever shall have eaten it shall never die;* and it is the body of Christ." [2]

According to him, therefore, the faithful only can eat the body of Christ. And these words may throw light on the meaning of other phrases in the same work.

Isidore of Seville, commenting upon the same passage in Genesis as Ambrose in an extract just made from him (Gen. xlix. 20.) gives it the same interpretation. He says that Asher there may be taken as referring to Christ, and then he adds,—

"Whose bread is made fat, namely his flesh, which is the food of saints, of which he who has eaten shall never die." [3]

[1] Omnis itaque anima, quæ recipit panem illum descendentem de cœlo, domus panis est, hoc est, panis Christi, quæ habitantis in se panis cœlestis firmamento alitur, et corde confirmatur. Unde et Paulus ait: *Omnes enim unus panis sumus.* Id. Ep. ad Horont. ep. 70. § 13. Op. ii. 1065.

[2] Panem illum qui manducaverunt omnes in deserto mortui sunt: ista autem esca quam accipis, iste panis vivus qui descendit de cœlo, vitæ æternæ substantiam subministrat; et quicumque hunc manducaverit, non morietur in æternum: et est corpus Christi. Id. De Myst. c. 8. Op. ii. 337.

[3] Cujus panis pinguis factus est, caro scilicet ejus, quæ est esca sanctorum; quam si quis manducaverit, non morietur in æternum. Isidor. Hispal. Quæst. in Vet. Test. c. xxxi. § 48, 49. Op. v. 354, 355.

The next I would refer to is Jerome. Commenting on Isaiah lxvi. 17., he says,—

"Applying the passage metaphorically, we may say, that all those who are lovers of pleasure more than lovers of God are sanctified in gardens, &c., because they are not able to enter into the mysteries of the truth, and eat the meats of wickedness, while they are not holy in body and spirit; *neither do they eat the flesh of Jesus, nor drink his blood;* of which he himself says, 'He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life.'" [1]

And elsewhere he says, that "heretics do not eat the flesh of Christ, *whose flesh is the food of believers.*" [2]

Archdeacon Wilberforce suggests in a note,[3] that Jerome has said,—"We pollute the bread, that is, the Body of Christ, when we approach the altar unworthily." [4]

But after all the proofs given that the common title for *the bread* was *the Body of Christ,* with those who nevertheless only held it to be the symbol and representative of the Body of Christ, such a passage as this presents no difficulty.

So Macarius tells us that,—

"As a rich man . . . gives one sort of food to his servants and another to his own children," [5] "so also Christ the true Lord hath created all things himself, and nourishes the wicked and the ungrateful; but the children whom he has begotten himself, and whom he has made partakers of his grace, in whom the Lord is formed, he nourishes with a peculiar refreshment and food, and meat and drink, beyond other men, and gives himself to them while they hold communion with their Father;[6] as the Lord says, 'He that eateth

[1] Secundum tropologiam possumus dicere, omnes voluptatis magis amatores quam amatores Dei sanctificari in hortis et in liminibus, quia mysteria veritatis non valent introire, et comedere cibos impietatis, dum non sunt sancti corpore et spiritu: nec comedunt carnem Jesu, neque bibunt sanguinem ejus. De quo ipse loquitur, Qui comedit carnem meam, et bibit sanguinem meum, habet vitam æternam. Hieron. Comment. in Isai. c. 66. v. 17. Op. ed. cit. tom. iv. col. 816.

[2] Nec comedentes [i. e. hæretici] ejus [i. e. Christi] carnem, cujus caro cibus credentium est. Id. Comm. in Hos. c. 8. v. 12. ib. tom. vi. col. 89.

[3] On Euch. p. 309; or, 3rd ed. p. 266.

[4] Polluimus panem, id est, corpus Domini, quando indigni accedimus ad altare. Hieron. In Mal. i. 7. Op. vi. 949.

[5] Ἄλλην τροφὴν δίδωσι τοῖς δούλοις, καὶ ἄλλην τοῖς ἰδίοις τέκνοις.

[6] Τὰ δὲ τέκνα, ἃ ἐγέννησεν ἐκ τοῦ σπέρματος αὐτοῦ, καὶ οἷς μετέδωκεν ἐκ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ, ἐν οἷς ἐμορφώθη ὁ Κύριος, ἰδίαν ἀνάπαυσιν καὶ τροφὴν, καὶ βρῶσιν, καὶ πόσιν, παρὰ τοὺς λοιποὺς ἀνθρώπους ἐκτρέφει, καὶ δίδωσιν ἑαυτὸν αὐτοῖς ἀναστρεφομένοις μετὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς αὐτῶν, ὥς φησιν ὁ Κύριος, κ. τ. λ.

my flesh and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him, and shall not see death.' "[1]

We find also, in the Catena on St. John's Gospel, published by Corderius, the following remark on John vi. 49, 50, cited from Chrysostom :—

"He that hath partaken of this food will be beyond the power of death."[2]

The sentence of which these words form a part does not appear in Chrysostom's Comment on St. John, *as printed in his Works;* but that fact is by no means adverse to its genuineness, and only suggests the probability of there being here another instance of Romish suppression of Patristical testimony. For the sentence seems almost necessary to the completeness of the comment. And Corderius himself tells us, in his Preface, that he copied his Catena from a *very antient* MS.[3] And what precedes is given in the Catena as in the printed editions.

Hilary of Poictiers, also, speaking of our Lord's flesh and blood, says,—"These taken and imbibed cause us to be in Christ and Christ to be in us."[4]

This certainly cannot be said of the wicked, and therefore, according to this, they do not receive our Lord's flesh and blood.

And to a similar effect he says, that they to whom our Lord gives the food of eternal life,[5] are those "who shall labour for the meat that does not perish."[6]

And as to the meaning of the term *body of the Lord,* as ordinarily used with reference to the Eucharist, I may here give the reader an example from a Letter of an Arian Synod in 347, occurring in a fragment of an historical work of Hilary, to be added to those quoted above. Speaking of an outrage committed by an unprincipled person, it says,—"He openly and publicly profaned the consecrated *body of the Lord hanging on the priests' necks.*"[7]

[1] Macarii Ægypt. Homil. xiv. § 4. ed. Prit. Lips. 1714. pp. 175, 176.

[2] Ταύτης μέντοι τῆς τροφῆς μεταλαβὼν, ἀνώτερος ἔσται τοῦ θανάτου. Chrys. ut cit. in Catena in Johann. ed. Corderio, 1630. fol. in c. vi. vv. 49, 50. p. 191.

[3] Exemplar Græcum MS. quo usus sum erat antiquissimum. *Præf.*

[4] Hæc accepta atque hausta id efficiunt ut et nos in Christo et Christus in nobis sit. Hilar. Pict. De Trin. lib. viii. § 14. Op. col. 956.

[5] Escam præbens vitæ æternæ.

[6] Qui operabuntur escam non intereuntem. Id. ib. § 42. ib. c. 972, 973.

[7] Consecratum Domini corpus ad sacerdotum colla suspensum palam publiceque profanabat. Fragm. hist. *sub. fin.* Hilarii Op. col. 1313.

What this was, I suppose no one is prepared to dispute; at least, I trust not.

Lastly, we have several testimonies to the same effect from Cyril of Alexandria. Thus he says,—

"It is a token that the Son is properly and truly the bread of life, that those who have *once* partaken of him, and in a certain way been mingled with him through communion, are manifested to have power over the very bonds of death." [1]

Again,—

"They who carry the bread of life in themselves, shall have the gift of immortality, and, freed altogether from corruption and the evils that flow from it, shall ascend to the eternal and endless duration of the life that is with Christ." [2]

Again,—

"The body of Christ gives life to those that partake of it; for it drives away death when it comes into those subject to death, and removes corruption, producing perfectly in itself a cause that makes corruption disappear." [3]

Again, on the words, "He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me and I in him," he says,—

"For as, if any one hath mixed wax with other wax, he will assuredly see one to have entered into the other, in the same way, I think, he who *receives* the flesh of our Saviour Christ, and drinks his precious blood, as he himself says, is found to be one as it were with him, being mixed up as it were and commingled with him *through that participation*, so that he is found in Christ, and Christ, on the other hand, in him." [4]

[1] Σημεῖον δὲ πάλιν ὁμοίως τοῦ κυρίως τε καὶ ἀληθῶς ἄρτον εἶναι ζωῆς τὸν υἱὸν, τὸ καὶ αὐτῶν ἀναδείκνυσθαι κρείττονας τῶν ἐκ θανάτου δεσμῶν τοὺς ἅπαξ μετεσχηκότας, καὶ ἀνακεκραμένους τρόπον τινα διὰ τῆς κοινωνίας αὐτῷ. Cyrill. Alex. Comment. in Johan. lib. 4. c. 2. Op. ed. Aubert. tom. iv. pp. 350, 351.

[2] Οἱ δὲ τὸν ἄρτον ἐν ἑαυτοῖς εἰσκομίζοντες τῆς ζωῆς, γέρας ἕξουσι τὴν ἀθανασίαν, φθορᾶς τε καὶ τῶν ἐκ ταύτης κακῶν παντελῶς ἀλογήσαντες, πρὸς ἀμήρυτόν τε καὶ ἀτελεύτητον βίου τοῦ κατὰ Χριστὸν ἀναβήσονται μῆκος. Id. ib. p. 351.

[3] Ζωοποιεῖ τοὺς μετέχοντας αὐτοῦ τὸ σῶμα Χριστοῦ· ἐξελαύνει γὰρ τὸν θάνατον, ὅταν ἐν τοῖς ἀποθνήσκουσι γένηται, καὶ ἐξίστησι φθορὰν, τὸν τὴν φθορὰν ἀφανίζοντα λόγον τελείως ὠδῖνον ἐν ἑαυτῷ. Id. ib. p. 354.

[4] "Ωσπερ γὰρ εἴτις κηρὸν ἑτέρῳ συνάψειε κηρῷ, πάντως δήπου καὶ ἕτερον ἐν ἑτέρῳ γεγονότα κατόψεται· τὸν αὐτὸν, οἶμαι, τρόπον καὶ ὁ τὴν σάρκα δεχόμενος τοῦ

Again,—

"For the body of Christ causes him that has *tasted of it* to live for ever."[1]

Now if such are the consequences of *partaking of* the body of Christ, of *receiving* the flesh of Christ, of *tasting* the body of Christ, it is quite clear that the wicked, however frequently they may receive the sacrament of his body, do not partake of, or receive, or taste the real body of Christ.

To make these passages, therefore, consistent with the doctrine of the Authors under review, we must insert in them words that are not found there, and say that they all mean *worthy* and *spiritual* participation and reception and tasting. That is, we must make the passages speak a very different language from what we find in them as written by Cyril.

But Archdeacon Wilberforce finds in Cyril a passage which he thinks supports his doctrine, namely, the following, which I give precisely as the Archdeacon has quoted it :—

"Christ comes and appears to *all of us*, both invisibly and visibly; invisibly indeed as God, but visibly by his body. For he permits and allows us to touch his sacred flesh. For by the favour of God we approach to the participation of the mystic Eucharist, receiving Christ in our hands. (In Joann. xii. vol. iv. p. 1104.)"[2]

But the slightest examination of this passage shows us, that it is a most unfortunate quotation for the Archdeacon to have made. For, does he suppose that Cyril thought that our Lord's real body is *visible* in the Eucharist? or that we can *touch* it there? No, he repudiates the notion of our Lord's body being the subject of any one of our senses. The passage, therefore, is directly against him, for it shows that Cyril spoke of the visible and tangible elements as *themselves* our Lord's body and blood, which they can only be figuratively and representatively. The

σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Χριστοῦ, καὶ πίνων αὐτοῦ τὸ τίμιον αἷμα, καθά φησιν αὐτὸς, ἓν ὡς πρὸς αὐτὸν εὑρίσκεται, συνανακιρνάμενος ὥσπερ καὶ ἀναμιγνύμενος αὐτῷ διὰ τῆς μεταλήψεως, ὡς ἐν Χριστῷ μὲν αὐτὸν εὑρίσκεσθαι, Χριστὸν δὲ αὖ πάλιν ἐν αὐτῷ. ID. ib. pp. 364, 365.

[1] Ζῆν γὰρ εἰς αἰῶνα ποιεῖ [i. e τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ] τὸν ἀπογευσάμενον. ID. ib. p. 372.

[2] WILB. On Euch. p. 308, or, 3rd edit. p. 265.

fact, that Cyril speaks of our Lord's body and blood as the subjects of our senses in the Eucharist, shows in what sense He used those terms.

And on the same ground we may dispose at once of the passage the Archdeacon quotes from Firmilian,[1] protesting against wicked men being allowed to "*touch* the Body and Blood of the Lord." The fact, that the real body and blood of our Lord are admitted to be not the objects of any of the senses in the Eucharist, proves at once the meaning of this passage, namely, that it refers to the sacramental body and blood, that which was commonly called the body and blood of the Lord.

All the other passages adduced by the Archdeacon[2] admit of a similar answer. In all of them the terms, body and blood of Christ, are clearly used as denoting the sacramental signs and symbols of his body and blood, according to what Augustine tells us was the common usage of those times.

Of this usage the Archdeacon, as far as appears, is unconscious; and to this cause therefore we must, I suppose, attribute the confident statements he has made as to the doctrine of the Fathers on this subject.

The same answer applies to the passages of the Fathers, quoted by Bellarmine[3] from their comments on 1 Cor. xi. 27; in which, he says, they make the sin to consist in men daring to receive *the body of the Lord* when in a state of sin. No doubt they do; and, both according to the ordinary phraseology of their times and correct sacramental language at all times, very properly so.

Thus, for instance, Theodoret, one of those quoted by him, says, that—

"They dishonour him [Christ] who receive his most holy body with unclean hands, and carry it to an impure mouth."[4]

But, as we have seen, the same Theodoret tells us,[5] that our

[1] Ib. p. 307, (or) 3rd ed. p. 265.

[2] Ib. pp. 307, 308, (or) 3rd ed. pp. 264—266.

[3] Bellarm. De Euch. i. 13. Op. iii. 451.

[4] Ἀτιμάζουσιν αὐτὸν οἱ τὸ πανάγιον αὐτοῦ σῶμα χερσὶν ἀκαθάρτοις δεχόμενοι, καὶ ἐναγεῖ προσφέροντες στόματι. Theodoret. In Ep. 1. ad Corinth. c. xi. v. 27. Op. iii. 238.

[5] See p. 248 above.

Lord "gave to the symbol the name of the body," and "honoured the visible symbols with the appellation of his body and blood."

And Isidore of Sevile, in *the very same sentence* in which he uses the words, "that, in honor of so great a sacrament, *the Body of the Lord* should enter *the mouth of a Christian* before other meats," adds these words,—"*Bread* [the bread], inas- "much as it strengthens the body, is therefore *called the Body* "*of Christ;* but *wine* [the wine], inasmuch as it produces "blood in the flesh, is therefore referred to *the Blood of* "*Christ.*" [1]

I will only add, in the words of Bishop Bilson (a Tractarian referee), in his controversy with the Romanists,—

"What marvel if the Catholic Fathers used often the names of the body and blood of Christ, where the material elements of bread and wine must be understood; since this is the certain rule of all sacraments, and the common order of all antient divines writing of the Lord's Supper, to call the gifts proposed at the Lord's Table the body and blood of Christ? *The wilful contempt of which observation hath miserably snared and hampered you and your fellows*, everywhere referring and forcing that to the natural flesh of Christ, which by the learned and godly Fathers was spoken and meant of the visible signs called by the names of the body and blood of Christ." [2]

(23.) *The Fathers maintain, that we are incorporated into Christ by faith.*

Thus, for instance, Augustine, speaking of the difference between believing that Christ is Christ, and believing in Christ, and that he only believes in Christ who also hopes in Christ and loves Christ, says of this operative faith,—

"He therefore who believes in Christ by placing his faith in him, Christ comes into him, and is in a certain way united to him, and he is made a member in his body." [3]

[1] See p. 242 above.

[2] Bilson, Of Christian Subjection, &c. Oxf. 1585. p. 756.

[3] Qui ergo in Christum credit, credendo in Christum, venit in eum Christus, et quodam modo unitur in eum, et membrum in corpore ejus efficitur. August. Serm. 144. (De verb. Evang. Joh. 16.) § 2. Op. v. 483.

Again, in answer to the supposed question, where Christ now is in regard to us, he says,—

"Behold where he is; he is in thee, because his faith is in thee. Does the Apostle deceive us when he says, that Christ dwells in our hearts by faith? *Now* by faith; *then* [*i. e.* at a future time] by actual form: now by faith, so long as we are in the way, so long as we are on our journey. For as long as we are in the body, we are absent from the Lord."[1]

Again he speaks of our Lord as saying,—

"He that cometh unto me is incorporated into me."[2]

And again expressly,—

"By faith we are united to the body of Christ."[3]

And in similar language Paulinus, in his letter to Augustine, preserved in Augustine's works, speaks of—

"The food which produces the substance of eternal life through our faith, by which we are incorporated together in Christ Jesus our Lord."[4]

So Cyril of Alexandria, in the following important passage, on the words, "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life:"—

"Not arbitrarily or without demonstration does the most wise Baptist bear witness, that life accrues as a reward to those who believe in Christ; but he draws his proof from, so to speak, the very quality of the things. For the only-begotten is life by nature. 'For in him we live and move and have our being.' *But he is wholly introduced into us by faith, and he dwells in us by the Holy Spirit.*[5] And this the Evangelist John witnesses in his Epistles, saying, 'By this we know that he is in us, that he hath given us of

[1] Ecce ubi est; in te est, quia et fides ipsa in te ipso est. An fallit nos Apostolus, qui dicit habitare Christum per fidem in cordibus nostris? Modo per fidem; tunc per speciem; modo per fidem, quamdiu in via, quamdiu in peregrinatione. Quamdiu enim sumus in corpore, peregrinamur a Domino. Id. Serm. 158. (De verb. Apost. Rom. viii.) § 8. Op. v. 532.

[2] Qui ad me venit incorporatur mihi. Id. In Joh. Evang. tract. 25. § 16. Op. iii. Pt. 2. c. 356.

[3] Per fidem copulamur [*i. e.* corpori Christi]. Id. ib. tract. 27. § 7. ib. 365.

[4] De his [*i. e.* Augustini libris] cibum capio, non illum qui perit, sed qui operatur vitæ æternæ substantiam per fidem nostram, qua adcorporamur in Christo Jesu Domino nostro. Paulini. Ep. ad August. inter August. Epist. Ep. 25. § 1. August. Op. ii. 27.

[5] Εἰσοικίζεται δὲ πάντως ἡμῖν διὰ τῆς πίστεως, καὶ κατοικεῖ διὰ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος.

his Spirit.' Therefore Christ will give life to those that believe in him, as being himself life by nature, and henceforth will dwell in them. But *that the Son takes up his abode in us by faith*,[1] Paul will assure us, saying, 'For this cause I bow my knees, &c. *that Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith*.' Since therefore *He who is life by nature enters into us by faith*,[2] is he not true who says, 'He that believeth on the Son, hath everlasting life?'"[3]

Again, in a subsequent part of the same work, he says,—

"For Christ is to us the beginning and foundation for sanctification and righteousness, *namely, through faith, and in no other way; for thus does he dwell within us*."[4]

Thus also on the words, "we are made partakers of Christ," &c. (Heb. iii. 14.), Chrysostom says,—

"What means, 'We are made partakers of Christ'? By partaking of him he means, that we and he are become one; since he is the head, and we the body, fellow-heirs and of the same body [or, concorporeal]. We are one body; 'of his flesh,' says the Apostle, 'and of his bones.' 'If we hold fast the beginning [or, first principle] of our subsistence[5] stedfast unto the end.' What means, 'the beginning of our subsistence'? *He speaks of faith*, by which we subsist, and were born, and, so to speak, *were made of one body with him*."[6]

And again, in a work which passes under his name, and may certainly be referred to on such a point, we read,—

"First understand, how Christ is born in us, and how he is slain. For when we believe in Christ, we beget and form Christ in us, as the Apostle said to the Galatians, 'My little children, of whom I travail in birth again until Christ be formed in you.' And con-

[1] Ὅτι δὲ διὰ τῆς πίστεως ὁ υἱὸς αὐλίζεται, πληροφορήσει λέγων ὁ Παῦλος, κ. τ. λ.

[2] Ὅτε τοίνυν διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἡ κατὰ φύσιν ἡμῖν ἐπεισκρίνεται ζωή, πῶς, κ. τ. λ.

[3] Cyrill. Alex. Comment. in Johan. lib. ii. Op. iv. 173.

[4] Ἀρχὴ γὰρ ἡμῖν καὶ θεμέλιος εἰς ἁγιασμὸν καὶ δικαιοσύνην Χριστὸς, διὰ πιστέως δὲ δηλονότι, καὶ οὐχ ἑτέρως· οὕτω γὰρ ἡμῖν ἐνοικίζεται. Id. ib. lib. iv. ib. p. 393.

[5] So he appears to have interpreted the passage, and not without reason, for our translation is hardly warranted by the original.

[6] Τί ἐστι, μέτοχοι γεγόναμεν τοῦ Χριστοῦ; μετέχομεν αὐτοῦ, φησιν, ἓν ἐγενόμεθα ἡμεῖς καὶ αὐτός· εἴπερ αὐτὸς μὲν κεφαλὴ, σῶμα δὲ ἡμεῖς, συγκληρονόμοι καὶ σύσσωμοι· ἓν σῶμά ἐσμεν, ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ, φησι, καὶ ἐκ τῶν ὀστέων αὐτοῦ. Ἐάν πὲρ τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς ὑποστάσεως μέχρι τέλους βεβαίαν κατάσχωμεν. Τί ἐστιν ἀρχὴ τῆς ὑποστάσεως; τὴν πίστιν λέγει, δι' ἧς ὑπέστημεν, καὶ γεγενήμεθα, καὶ συνουσιώθημεν, ὡς ἄν τις εἴποι. Chrys. In Epist. ad Hebr. hom. vi. § 1. Op. xii. 64.

sequently when we lose the faith of Christ, we slay Christ within us." [1]

And, in very similar language, the Author who passes under the name of Dionysius the Areopagite, attributes our union to Christ, and "participation of him and his blessings," to our being united to his divine life by imitating it; and "in this way," he says, "we shall be truly made partakers of God and divine things." [2]

And this passage occurs *in the midst of his description of the Eucharistic rite*, and without any allusion to our becoming incorporated with Christ by partaking of the bread and wine. He attributes such a participation of Christ only to spiritual acts.

According to the Fathers, therefore, the *primary* cause of our incorporation into Christ is *faith*. Following the direct and express testimony of the Apostle, they hesitate not to attribute to faith, primarily, our indwelling in Christ and incorporation into him; not to any bodily conjunction of our bodies with his by our eating his body with our mouths in the Eucharist.

(24.) *The Fathers maintain, that we are incorporated into Christ by Baptism.*

The Fathers, as they attribute our incorporation into Christ primarily to faith, so, as Baptism is the appointed ordinance for declaring our faith, and for being formally received as members of Christ's Church, they tell us, that we are incorporated into Christ, and become his members, through baptism; if it is received in a sound state of mind, that is, where there is true faith. And therefore so far from attributing our incorporation into Christ to our bodily reception of his real body and blood, they say that we are so incorporated before we receive the Eucharist, and that we come to it as men already belonging to

[1] Primum intellige, quomodo nascitur Christus in nobis, et quomodo occiditur. Quando enim credimus in Christum, Christum generamus et formamus in nobis, sicut dicebat Apostolus Galatis: Filioli mei, &c.... Consequenter et quando perdimus fidem Christi, Christum occidimus in nobis. AUCT. SUB NOM. CHRYSOST. Op. Imp. in Matth. hom. 46. Op. vi. App. p. cxcvi.

[2] Εἰς μετουσίαν ἑαυτοῦ καὶ τῶν οἰκείων ἀγαθῶν καλοῦντα τὸ ἀνθρώπειον φύλον, εἴπερ ἐνωθῶμεν αὐτοῦ τῇ θειοτάτῃ ζωῇ, πρὸς αὐτὴν ἡμῶν κατὰ δύναμιν ἀφομοιώσει, καὶ ταύτῃ πρὸς ἀλήθειαν κοινωνοὶ Θεοῦ καὶ τῶν θείων ἀποτελεσθησόμεθα. PSEUDO-DIONYS. AREOP. De eccles. hierarch. c. iii. §§ 12, 13. Op. ed. cit. i. 197.

and forming part of that body of Christ of which we are called to partake in that holy rite.

Thus Augustine says, that—

"By baptism men are buried with Christ, that they may be incorporated into him as his members, that is, his faithful ones." [1]

And therefore, as we have seen in a passage formerly quoted,[2] Augustine, when addressing some young persons who were about to come to the Eucharist *for the first time*, tells them that in coming to receive the sacrament of Christ's *body*, they were coming to receive the sacrament of *themselves*. "The "sacrament of yourselves is placed upon the Lord's table; ye "*receive* the sacrament of yourselves. To that which ye *are*, "ye answer, Amen, and by answering subscribe to it. For "you hear, 'The body of Christ;' and you answer Amen."

And so elsewhere he says,—"We *are* what we *receive*." [3]

Similarly Fulgentius, in a passage already quoted,[4] after saying that those baptized "in a sound state of mind" eat and drink the body and blood of Christ in baptism, adds,—

"For what is done in the sacrament of holy baptism, but that *believers* are made members of our Lord Jesus Christ, and belong to the communion of his body by ecclesiastical unity?"—"Then does each one begin to be a partaker of that one bread, when he begins to be a member of that one body, which, in each of its members, *when it is joined in baptism to the head Christ*, is then at once truly offered to God a living victim."

And therefore he also adds, like Augustine, that by baptism received by a man "*in a sound state of mind*," he "becomes that which he is about to take from the sacrifice of the altar."

Thus also speaks Chrysostom:—

"How then are we 'of his flesh and of his bones?' .... because as he was born of the Holy Spirit without bodily conjunction, so are we also born in the bath." [5]

[1] Ad hanc [dispensationem] pertinet baptismus, quo Christo consepeliuntur, ut incorporentur illi membra ejus, hoc est fideles ejus. AUGUST. De pecc. mer. et remiss. lib. i. c. 26, or, § 39. Op. x. 15. This is probably the passage from which the quotation in the Canon Law (Decret. Grat. Pt. 3. De cons. dist. 4. c. 143. Corp. Jur. Can. ed. Lugd. 1624. tom. i. col. 2030.) is taken; and which is as follows:—Ad hoc baptismus valet, ut baptizati Christo incorporentur, et membra ejus habeantur.

[2] See pp. 288, 289 above. [3] See p. 290 above. [4] See pp. 291—293 above.

[5] Πῶς οὖν ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ ἐσμεν, καὶ ἐκ τῶν ὀστῶν αὐτοῦ; .... ὅτι ὥσπερ

And he blames the heretics for not holding that we are thus made his body, asking how this notion consists with the declaration, that we are "of his flesh and his bones."[1]

And immediately after he adds,—

"As therefore the Son of God is of our nature, so are we of his substance; and as he has us in himself, so have we him in us."[2]

And again he tells us, that upon being baptized,—

"We take hold of the Lord, are mingled with his body, and joined to his body that sits above, where the devil cannot enter."[3]

And again, on the words of the Apostle, "As many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ," he says,—

"And why did he not say,—As many of you as have been baptized into Christ have been born of God? For this was the inference to prove them sons. Because he expresses it in a much more awful way. For if Christ is the Son of God, and you have put him on, having the Son in thyself and been made like unto him, you have been brought into one kindred and one form with him."[4]

And therefore he does not suppose a bodily reception of his body by our body to be necessary to produce incorporation with Christ. He holds that Christ is in us and we in him by the sacrament of baptism, although neither he nor anybody else holds that Christ's flesh and blood are really in the water of baptism. The incorporation takes place through the agency of the Holy Spirit, and is altogether a *spiritual act*, represented outwardly by the sacramental act. He may therefore well speak of our incorporation with Christ by the Eucharist, without any

ἄνευ συνουσίας ἐκεῖνος γεγέννηται ἐκ Πνεύματος ἁγίου, οὕτω καὶ ἡμεῖς γεννώμεθα ἐν τῷ λουτρῷ. CHRYS. In Ephes. hom. 20. § 3. Op. ed. Ben. Par. tom. xi. p. 147.

[1] Ὅτι δὲ γινόμεθα αὐτοῦ σῶμα, οὐ δέχονται. Ἂν τοίνυν τοῦτο μὴ γινόμεθα, πῶς ἁρμόσει τὸ, Ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ, κ. τ. λ. ID. ib.

[2] Ὡς οὖν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ τῆς ἡμετέρας φύσεως, οὕτως ἡμεῖς τῆς οὐσίας αὐτοῦ· καὶ ὡς ἡμᾶς ἐκεῖνος ἔχει ἐν ἑαυτῷ, οὕτω καὶ ἡμεῖς αὐτὸν ἔχομεν ἐν ἡμῖν. ID. ib. § 4. ib.

[3] Αὐτὸν εὐθέως περιλαμβάνεις τὸν δεσπότην, ἀνακεράννυσαι τῷ σώματι, ἀναφύρῃ τῷ σώματι τῷ ἄνω κειμενῷ, ἔνθα προσελθεῖν οὐκ ἔνι τῷ διαβόλῳ. ID. In Coloss. hom. vi. § 4. Op. xi. 370.

[4] Καὶ τίνος ἕνεκεν οὐκ εἶπεν, κ. τ. λ. . . . . τὸν υἱὸν ἔχων ἐν ἑαυτῷ καὶ πρὸς αὐτὸν ἀφομοιωθείς, εἰς μίαν συγγένειαν καὶ μίαν ἰδέαν ἦχθης. ID. In Gal. iii. 27. Op. x. 704.

notion of our oral reception of his body. And, in fact, if we are already incorporated into Christ, and made members of his body, previous to our coming to the Eucharist, what takes place in the Eucharist is but a renewal and strengthening of the union already existing, by fresh supplies, as it were, of vital influence and grace.

Thus also Athanasius says, that, when we are regenerated by water and the Spirit, "our flesh is no longer earthly, but made that of the Word, through the Word of God, who was made flesh for us;"[1] and that we "are made divine by the Word, being assumed into the Deity through his flesh."[2]

He speaks of this effect as produced independently of a reception of the Eucharist.

So also Leo says,—

"He that is received by Christ, and that receives Christ, is not the same after the laver that he was before baptism, but the body of the regenerated man becomes the flesh of the Crucified."[3]

And similarly elsewhere,—

"As the Lord Jesus was made our flesh by being born, so are we made his body by being new-born. Therefore we are both members of Christ and a temple of the Holy Spirit."[4]

And Mark the Hermit says of a person baptized, that,—"From his baptism he has Christ lying hidden within him."[5]

And Hilary, maintaining that Christians are "one by the nature of one faith," and "one in the regeneration of the same nature,"

[1] "Ωσπερ γὰρ ἐκ γῆς ὄντες πάντες ἐν τῷ Ἀδὰμ ἀποθνήσκομεν· οὕτως ἄνωθεν ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ Πνεύματος ἀναγεννηθέντες ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ πάντες ζωοποιούμεθα, οὐκέτι ὡς γηΐνης ἀλλὰ λοιπὸν λογωθείσης τῆς σαρκὸς διὰ τὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγον, ὃς δι' ἡμᾶς ἐγένετο σάρξ. ATHANAS. Orat. 3. contra Arian. § 33. Op. ed. Ben. Par. tom. i. p. 583.

[2] Παρὰ τοῦ Λόγου τεθεοποιούμεθα, προσληφθέντες διὰ τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ. ID. ib. § 34. p. 584.

[3] Susceptus a Christo, Christumque suscipiens, non idem sit post lavacrum qui ante baptismum fuit, sed corpus regenerati fiat caro Crucifixi. LEO MAGN. Serm. 63. (De Pass. Dom. 12.) c. 6. Op. ed. Baller. tom. i. col. 246.

[4] Sicut factus est Dominus Jesus caro nostra nascendo, ita et nos facti sumus corpus ipsius renascendo. Ideo et membra Christi, et templum sumus Spiritus Sancti. ID. Serm. 23. (In Nativ. Dom. 3.) c. 5. ib. col. 77.

[5] Ὁ γὰρ νοήσας ἀκριβῶς, ὅτι ἀπὸ τοῦ βαπτίσματος τὸν Χριστὸν ἐν ἑαυτῷ κεκρυμμένον ἔχει, κατὰ τὸν ἀπόστολον, πάντα ῥίψας, κ. τ. λ. MARC. EREM. Opusc. iv. De Bapt.—Inter Bibl. Patr. ed. Galland. Venet. 1765 et seq. tom. viii. p. 45.

adds, that they are also "one inasmuch as they are *clothed with one Christ by the nature of one baptism;*"[1] and this unity, he contends, is more than a unity of concord and will, and may properly be called a "natural unity;"[2]—a remark to which I shall have to call the attention of the reader hereafter, when meeting some passages cited from Hilary against the doctrine for which I am contending.

So in a Collection of Notes on some passages of Scripture by Cyril of Alexandria and others, the soul is spoken of as being "perfectly conjoined to Christ by holy baptism."[3]

(25.) *Language parallel to that used by the Fathers with respect to the Eucharist, and on account of which they are referred to as maintaining the doctrine of a real objective presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in or with or under the consecrated bread and wine, or, under their forms, is also used by them with reference to the sacrament of baptism, where such language confessedly is not used to imply any such presence.*

I have already pointed out, that the Fathers speak of our eating and drinking the body and blood of Christ in Baptism, just as they do of our eating and drinking them in the Eucharist;[4] and also of our being incorporated into Christ by baptism more than by the Eucharist.[5] But we also find them using parallel phrases respecting the two rites in other points.

Thus, for instance,—

(*a.*) As they speak of Christ's presence in the sacrament of the Eucharist, so do they of his presence at Baptism.

[1] Si ergo per fidem, id est, per unius fidei naturam unum omnes erant, quomodo non *naturalem* in his intelligis *unitatem*, qui *per naturam unius fidei unum sunt?*..... Cessat in his assensus unitas, qui *unum sunt in ejusdem regeneratione naturæ*..... Docet enim Apostolus ex natura sacramentorum esse hanc fidelium unitatem, ad Galatas scribens: 'Quotquot enim in Christo baptizati estis, Christum induistis. Non inest, &c., omnes enim vos unum estis in Christo Jesu.' Quod unum sunt in tanta gentium conditionum sexuum diversitate, numquid ex assensu voluntatis est, aut ex sacramenti unitate, quia his et baptisma sit unum, et unum Christum induti omnes sunt? Quid ergo hic animorum concordia faciet, cum *per id unum sint*, quod uno Christo per naturam unius baptismi induantur. Hilar. Pictav. De Trin. lib. viii. §§ 7, 8. Op. ed. Ben. Par. 1693. col. 951, 952.

[2] See the passage just quoted, and also the subsequent context, where it is said,—Itaque qui per rem eamdem unum sunt, natura etiam unum sunt, non tantum voluntate. Ib. § 9. col. 952.

[3] Συναφθεῖσα τελείως τῷ Χριστῷ διὰ τοῦ ἁγίου βαπτίσματος. Cyrill. Alex. et aliorum Collectanea, &c. In Op. Cyrill. Alex. tom. vi. Pt. 3. p. 39.

[4] See pp. 326—328 above.

[5] See p. 377, et seq. above.

Thus Augustine expressly puts together Christ's presence at Baptism and the Eucharist as of the same kind. He says,—

"If you are good, if you belong to the Body .... you have Christ with you both at the present time and at the future; at the present time through faith, at the present time through a symbol, at the present time through the sacrament of baptism, at the present time through the meat and drink of the altar." [1]

In like manner we find Ambrose speaking. Thus, commenting on Psalm l. 7 et seq. "I was shapen in iniquity, &c., deliver me from blood-guiltiness, O God," &c., he says that—

The Psalmist, while he thus spoke, suddenly "with a prophetic spirit saw the very sacraments of the heavenly mysteries, the type of which Moses prefigured in the Law;" "he foresaw the sacrament of baptism, and admiring the grace suddenly exclaimed, 'Behold thou hast loved truth; thou hast manifested to me the doubtful and secret things of thy wisdom.' .... Behold now, *not in a shadow, nor in a figure, nor in a type, but in truth* the light openly shines; behold now I see the truth, I acknowledge the splendour of the truth .... thou hast manifested thyself to me, O Christ, not by a glass, not obscurely, but face to face; *I find thee in thy sacraments.*" [2]

These words, it will be observed, are expressly used with reference to the sacrament of Baptism; and of this sacrament it is said, that Christ is manifested in it, *not in a shadow or figure or type, but in truth or reality.*

Again, in a work commonly attributed to him, it is said,—

"Believe therefore that the presence of the Divinity is there [i. e. in baptism]. Thou believest the operation [of the Divinity],

[1] Si bonus es, si ad corpus pertines ..... habes Christum et in præsenti et in futuro; in præsenti per fidem, in præsenti per signum, in præsenti per baptismatis sacramentum, in præsenti per altaris cibum et potum. AUGUST. In Johann. Evang. tract. 50. 12. Op. tom. iii. Pt. 2. col. 460.

[2] Spiritu prophetico ipsa vidit mysteriorum sacramenta cœlestium, quorum typum Moses præfiguravit in Lege .... prævidit baptismatis sacramentum, et miratus gratiam exclamavit subito dicens; *Ecce enim veritatem dilexisti; incerta et occulta sapientiæ tuæ manifestasti mihi.* .... Ecce jam non in umbra, nec in figura, nec in typo, sed in veritate lux aperta resplendet: ecce nunc veritatem aspicio, splendorem veritatis agnosco .... non per speculum, non in ænigmate, sed facie ad faciem te mihi, Christe, demonstrasti; in tuis te invenio sacramentis. AMBROS. Apolog. David. c. 12. Op. i. 695, 696.

dost thou not believe the presence? Whence should the operation follow, unless the presence should precede it?"[1]

And further on in the same work;—

"Believe therefore that the Lord Jesus, invoked by the prayers of the priests, is present, who says, 'Where two or three,' &c.; how much more where the Church is, where his own mysteries [or, sacraments] are, does he there vouchsafe to impart his presence!"[2]

And so Gaudentius, just after speaking of *both* sacraments, says,—"We believe Christ to be in his sacraments."[3]

So Optatus still more expressly, speaking in the peculiar language of the period, says,—

"This [i. e. Christ] is the fish, which in baptism is by invocation *introduced into the waters of the font*, so that what had been water may also from the fish be called a fish-pond."[4]

And Gregory Nazianzen, speaking of baptism, says,—

"A greater than Solomon is here, in the case of those who think rightly in the matter."[5]

And Cyril of Alexandria still more emphatically speaks to the same purpose, observing (in a passage already quoted[6]), that we, "*knowing that the Son of God himself invisibly floats upon the waters of the holy font*, are washed with faith."

Archdeacon Wilberforce attempts to account for such passages by saying, that "Christ's body is present in baptism, only because He is present with whom it is personally united; but in the Holy Eucharist the presence of Christ's body is the reason why He himself is present.....Christ may be *said* to

[1] Crede ergo divinitatis illic adesse præsentiam. Operationem credis, non credis præsentiam? Unde sequeretur operatio, nisi præcederet ante præsentia? Id. De Myster. c. 3. Op. ii. 327.

[2] Crede ergo adesse Dominum Jesum invocatum precibus sacerdotum, qui ait: Ubi fuerint duo vel tres, &c.; quanto magis ubi est Ecclesia, ubi mysteria sua sunt, ibi dignatur suam impertire præsentiam! Id. ib. c. 5. ib. 332.

[3] Quem [i. e. Christum] sacramentis suis inesse credimus. Gaudentii Brix. De Exod. lect. serm. 3. fin. Op. ed. cit. c. 245.

[4] Hic est piscis, qui in baptismate per invocationem fontalibus undis inseritur, ut quæ aqua fuerat, a pisce etiam piscina vocitetur. Optat. Milev. De schism. Donat. lib. iii. § 2. ed. Du Pin. Antw. 1702. p. 52.

[5] Καὶ ἰδοὺ πλεῖον Σολομῶντος ὧδε, παρὰ τοῖς τελείως λογιζομένοις. Gregor. Nazianz. Orat. xl. § 27. Op. i. 712, 713.

[6] See p. 328 above.

be present in Baptism; He is *really* present in the Holy Eucharist." [1]

But the Fathers draw no such distinction as this between the presence of Christ in baptism and his presence in the Eucharist. They do not say, that his presence is only *nominal* in baptism,—that he may be "*said* to be present" there,—but *real* in the Eucharist. They speak of Christ's *real* presence in both; and in similar terms—terms relating to his *body*. And if his body can be present in the form of a spirit simultaneously all over the earth, as the Archdeacon supposes, it is monstrous to say, that he withholds the presence of that body from the sacrament of baptism, while he gives it in the Eucharist. What ground, indeed, has the Archdeacon for affirming it? None. It is a mere gratuitous assertion, made for the purpose of supporting his dogma of the real presence in the Eucharist.

Moreover,—

(*b.*) As they speak of the wine in the Eucharist as the blood of Christ, so do they speak of the water of baptism as if it were Christ's blood, and we were baptized in that blood.

Thus Augustine says,—

"You are *washed with the blood of Christ*, when you are baptized in his death." [2]

And, in language somewhat similar, he says elsewhere, speaking of the Red Sea as typifying Christian baptism,—

"Whence is Christian baptism red, but as consecrated by the blood of Christ?" [3]

And so Origen, commenting on Gen. xlix. 11, "he shall wash his robe in wine and his clothing in the blood of the grape," says, that the robe of Christ is his Church, and "*in the wine of his blood*, that is, *in the laver of regeneration*, the Church is washed by Christ." [4]

[1] Wilb. On the Eucharist, p. 174, or, 3rd ed. p. 149.

[2] Ejus [*i. e.* Christi] sanguine rigaris, quando in morte ipsius baptizaris. August. Serm. de quart. fer. c. 2. (or, § 3.) Op. tom. vi. col. 444.

[3] Significabat mare illud rubrum baptismum Christi. Unde rubet baptismus Christi, nisi Christi sanguine consecratus? Id. Comm. in Joh. Evang. tract xi. 4. Op. tom. iii. Pt. 2. col. 274.

[4] In hujus enim sanguinis vino, id est, lavacro regenerationis a Christo lavatur Ecclesia. Origen. In Gen. hom. 17. § 8. Op. ed. Ben. Par. tom. ii. p. 109.

So Jerome, on the words Is. i. 16, "wash you, make you clean," &c., paraphrases them thus,—"Instead of the former "victims and holocausts, &c. . . . . the religion of the Gospel "pleases me, that ye may be *baptized in my blood* by the laver "of regeneration," &c.[1]

And again, on Is. liii. 7, speaking of the Ethiopian eunuch, he says,—

"Being immediately baptized *in the blood of the lamb of which he was reading*, he became worthy to be called a man, and was sent as an Apostle to the nation of the Æthiopians."[2]

So the Author of the work "On Baptism" attributed to Basil, says that he who is baptized—

"Hath put off the old man with his deeds *in the blood of Christ*."[3]

So also Pseudo-Prosper speaks of men being "dyed in the blood of Christ in baptism."[4]

And in very similar language Primasius says,—

"The red sea signifies baptism, adorned with the blood of Christ."[5]

Now in all these cases the Fathers clearly use the phrase, *the blood of Christ*, not literally but figuratively. They speak of the water of baptism as Christ's blood, because it represents Christ's blood.

And so Leo says, that "from the side of Christ flowed forth the blood of redemption and *the water of baptism*:"[6] meaning

[1] Pro superioribus victimis et holocaustis. . . . Evangelii mihi placet religio; ut baptizemini in sanguine meo per lavacrum regenerationis. HIERON. Comment. in Is. lib. i. in c. 1. Op. ed. cit. tom. iv. col. 22.

[2] Statim baptizatus in agni sanguine quem legebat, vir meruit appellari, et Apostolus genti Æthiopum missus est. ID. ib. lib. xiv. in c. 53. ib. col. 617.

[3] Ἐν τῷ αἵματι τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἀπεκδυσάμενος τὸν παλαιὸν ἄνθρωπον σὺν τοῖς πράξεσιν αὐτοῦ. BASIL. CÆS. De bapt. lib. i. c. 2. § 23. Op. ii. 646. The Benedictines have thrown this work into their Appendix as not written by Basil, but apparently on slight grounds.

[4] Baptismo Christi in sanguine tinguntur. PSEUDO-PROSPER. De promiss. et prædict. Pars. 2. c. 2. Inter Op. PROSPER. ed. Sirmond. Append.

[5] Mare rubrum significat baptismum, Christi sanguine decoratum. PRIMAS. Comment. in 1 Cor. x. Op. inter Bibl. Patr. ed. Migne, tom. lxviii. col. 529.

[6] De latere ipsius profluxerunt sanguis redemptionis et aqua baptismatis. LEONIS MAGN. Epist. 16. ad episc. Sicil. c. 6. Op. ed. Baller. tom. i. col. 722.

that the water that flowed from our Lord's pierced side typified the water of baptism.

All that Archdeacon Wilberforce can say in reply to such passages is, that they "may be discriminated from the language "used respecting the Holy Eucharist by two circumstances. "First—The effect spoken of was not consequent upon con- "secration; so that though consecration, where it was possible, "was always employed, it was as a matter of order, and not of "necessity. And therefore the thing, of which our Lord's "Blood is said to be the antitype, is not that portion of the "element which is specially employed, but the element at large. "Secondly—The employment of such language respecting Bap- "tism, is limited to the use made of the element by the "parties: water bears the same relation to the purifying of the "body, which the Blood of Christ bears to the soul: there is "not a word which implies that water in *itself* may take the "name of blood, or that the two are in any sense identical. "Yet since the Fathers had the analogy between the two "objects in their minds, why did they not speak of the water "in Baptism as being *really* blood, as they constantly iden- "tified the element in the Holy Eucharist with our Lord's "Body?"[1]

Now, as it respects the first of these supposed differences, the Archdeacon is altogether mistaken. It was to the water *as consecrated* for the specific purpose of baptism that the effect was attributed; and this water so consecrated was often spoken of by the Fathers as *changed*, and as having virtue given to it to produce certain effects, as I shall show under a subsequent head, to which, for the sake of avoiding repetition, I would here refer the reader.[2]

And so far from its being "not that portion of the element which is specially employed, but the element at large," that is referred to, the author of "De sacramentis" expressly says, "Not every water heals, but that water heals which has the grace "of Christ. . . . The water does not heal, unless the Spirit "descends and consecrates that water."[3]

As to the second, when the Archdeacon says, that "water

[1] Wilb. On the Euch. p. 266, (or) 3rd ed. pp. 228, 229.

[2] See pp. 395 et seq. below.

[3] See pp. 406, 407 below.

bears the same relation to the purifying of the body, which the Blood of Christ bears to the soul," I need only reply, that the bread and wine bear the same relation to the strengthening of the body, which the body and blood of Christ bear to the soul.

He adds, that "there is not a word which implies that water in *itself* may take the name of blood," and asks why the Fathers "did not speak of the water in Baptism as being *really* blood." The reply is to be found in the passages just quoted, where the Fathers *do* speak of the water in Baptism as if it was "really blood."

That they did not so frequently speak of the water in baptism as being the blood of Christ, as they did of the Eucharistic wine being so, nor point it out as such precisely in the same way, is at once accounted for by the fact, that the Eucharistic wine was specially designated by our Lord as a symbol of his blood.

But the phraseology of the Fathers with regard to the water of baptism, shows how such expressions were used by them; and adds another proof that such language was not literally, but figuratively and metaphorically, employed by them. If their language respecting the Eucharistic wine was intended to be interpreted literally, the use of such language as I have just quoted from them with respect to the water of baptism in merely a figurative sense, would have been most inconsistent and mischievous; in fact is not supposable.

Further,—

(*c.*) In the same exalted terms in which they speak of the nature and effects of the Eucharist, do they speak of the nature and effects of the Sacrament of Baptism.

Thus, as it is said, that by the Eucharist we obtain the hope and pledge of a future resurrection and immortality, which is used as an argument of our partaking of the real Body and Blood of Christ in it as a principle of life to our bodies as well as our souls; so it is said by Theodoret, that Baptism—

"Gives us the hope of the promised blessings, and makes us "partakers of the Lord's death and resurrection, and bestows "on us a participation of the gift of the Spirit, and renders us "sons of God, and not only sons, but heirs of God, and joint

"heirs with Christ;"[1] and that "by Baptism we receive a pledge of immortality."[2]

And Clement of Alexandria says,—

"Being baptized, we are enlightened; being enlightened, we "are adopted; being adopted, we are perfected; being per- "fected, we are made immortal;" and he adds, that "on "various grounds this work is called a gift of grace, and an "enlightenment, and a perfecting, and a laver;" proceeding to give the reasons for these names being applied to it.[3]

Thus also Gregory of Nazianzum says, that Baptism, among other things, is—

"The splendor of souls, ... the help of our infirmity, ... the "putting off of the flesh, the obtaining of the Spirit, the fellow- "ship of the Word, the restoration to uprightness of the creature, "the washing away of sin, the participation of light, the destruc- "tion of darkness; ... a vehicle to take us to God, a journeying "with Christ, a support of faith, a perfecting of the mind, a key "of the kingdom of heaven, a change of life, a deliverance from "slavery, a liberation from chains, a renewal of the whole "man;" nay, that it is "the most noble and excellent of "God's gifts." "We call it," he adds, "a gift, a grace, "baptism, unction, enlightenment, the clothing of immor- "tality, the laver of regeneration, a seal, everything that is "honorable." "The heavens rejoice with it, the angels glorify "it on account of the congeniality of its splendor. This is the "image of the blessedness that is there; this we desire to "celebrate with hymns of praise, but we are unable to do so to "the extent that it deserves."[4]

[1] Τὴν ἐλπίδα τῶν ἐπηγγελμένων ἐντίθησιν ἀγαθῶν, καὶ τοῦ δεσποτικοῦ θανάτου καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως καθίστησι κοινωνοὺς, καὶ τῆς τοῦ Πνεύματος δωρεᾶς τὴν μετουσίαν χαρίζεται, καὶ υἱοὺς ἀποφαίνει Θεοῦ, καὶ οὐ μόνον υἱοὺς, ἀλλὰ καὶ κληρονόμους Θεοῦ, καὶ συγκληρονόμους Χριστοῦ. THEODORET. Hæret. Fab. Compend. lib. 5. c. 18. Op. ed. Hal. 1769 et seq. iv. 441.

[2] Διὰ τοῦ παναγίου βαπτίσματος τὸν τῆς ἀθανασίας ἀρραβῶνα δεχόμεθα. ID. Interpr. Epist. ad Rom. c. 8. Ib. iii. 80, 81.

[3] Βαπτιζόμενοι, φωτιζόμεθα· φωτιζόμενοι, υἱοποιούμεθα· υἱοποιούμενοι, τελειούμεθα· τελειούμενοι, ἀπαθανατιζόμεθα. .... Καλεῖται δὲ πολλαχῶς τὸ ἔργον τοῦτο χάρισμα, καὶ φώτισμα, καὶ τέλειον, καὶ λουτρόν· κ. τ. λ. CLEM. ALEX. Pædag. lib. i. c. 6. Op. ed. Potter. Oxon. tom. i. p. 113.

[4] Λαμπρότης ἐστὶ ψυχῶν .... βοήθεια τῆς ἀσθενείας τῆς ἡμετέρας .... σαρκὸς

And elsewhere he says, that we are "*made divine by baptism.*"[1]

And similarly Basil calls Baptism—

"The price of redemption to captives, the remission of trespasses, the death of sin, the regeneration of the soul, a clothing of light, a seal which cannot be broken, a vehicle to heaven, a procurer of the kingdom, the gift of the grace of adoption."[2]

And Athanasius says, that in Baptism "the whole constitution of our faith is placed;"[3] and that when regenerated by water and the Spirit, "our flesh is *no longer earthly*," and that we "are made divine."[4]

And, as we have seen,[5] Leo tells us, that after baptism "the body of the regenerated man becomes the flesh of the Crucified."

And as they say we are nourished and vivified by the body and blood of Christ in the Eucharist, so they say that we die, are buried, and rise again in Baptism.

Thus Augustine, quoting the words of the Apostle, "We are buried with him by baptism into death," observes, "He does not say, we signify burial, but, distinctly, we are buried. The sacrament of so great a thing he calls by no other name than that of the thing itself."[6]

So also Chrysostom:—"Baptism is nothing else than the death of the baptized, and his resurrection."[7]

ἀπόθεσις, Πνεύματος ἀκολούθησις, Λόγου κοινωνία, πλάσματος ἐπανόρθωσις, κατακλυσμὸς ἁμαρτίας, φωτὸς μετουσία, σκότους κατάλυσις, .... ὄχημα πρὸς Θεον, συνεκδημία Χριστοῦ, ἔρεισμα πίστεως, νοῦ τελείωσις, κλεῖς οὐρανῶν βασιλείας, ζωῆς ἄμειψις, δουλείας ἀναίρεσις, δεσμῶν ἔκλυσις, συνθέσεως μεταποίησις .... τῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ δώρων τὸ κάλλιστον καὶ μεγαλοπρεπέστατον.—Δῶρον καλοῦμεν, χάρισμα, βάπτισμα, χρίσμα, φώτισμα, ἀφθαρσίας ἔνδυμα, λουτρὸν παλιγγενεσίας, σφραγῖδα, πᾶν ὅτι τίμιον .... Τουτῷ συγχαίρουσιν οὐρανοί· τοῦτο δοξάζουσιν ἄγγελοι, διὰ τὸ συγγενὲς τῆς λαμπρότητος· τοῦτο εἰκὼν τῆς ἐκεῖθεν μακαριότητος· τοῦτο ἡμεῖς ἐξυμνεῖν βουλόμεθα μὲν, οὐ δυνάμεθα δὲ ὅσον ἄξιον. GREGOR. NAZIANZ. Orat. 40. § 3, 4. Op. ed. cit. pp. 692, 693.

[1] Εἰ μὲν γὰρ οὐ προσκυνητὸν [i. e. τὸ Πνεῦμα], πῶς ἐμὲ θεοῖ διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος; ID. Orat. 31. § 28. Op. i. 574.

[2] Βάπτισμα αἰχμαλώτοις λύτρον, ὀφλημάτων ἄφεσις, θάνατος ἁμαρτίας, παλιγγενεσία ψυχῆς, ἔνδυμα φωτεινὸν, σφραγὶς ἀνεπιχείρητος, ὄχημα πρὸς οὐρανὸν, βασιλείας πρόξενον, υἱοθεσίας χάρισμα. BASIL. CÆS. Homil. in Bapt. § 5. Op. ed. cit. tom. ii. p. 117.

[3] Τὸ ἅγιον βάπτισμα, ἐν ᾧ πάσης πίστεως ἡμῶν ἡ σύστασις ὁρμεῖ. ATHANAS. Orat. 4. contra Arian. § 21. Op. ed. cit. tom. i. p. 633.

[4] See p. 380 above. [5] See p. 380 above. [6] See pp. 241, 242 above.

[7] Τὸ γὰρ βάπτισμα οὐδέν ἐστιν ἄλλο, ἢ ἀναίρεσις τοῦ βαπτιζομένου, καὶ ἔγερσις ἐκείνου. CHRYS. In Hebr. hom. ix. § 3. Op. ed. cit. tom. xii. p. 97.

Lastly,—

(*d.*) Various other phrases used by the Fathers with respect to the Eucharist, and quoted as showing their belief of that doctrine of the Real Presence here opposed, are also used by them with reference to Baptism.

Thus, as it is said sometimes by Patristical writers, that in the Eucharist "we offer up Christ sacrificed for our sins," and that "we offer up the sacrifice of the Body of Christ," as Archdeacon Wilberforce reminds us from Cyril of Jerusalem and Augustine;[1] so we are told by Augustine, that every man offers up Christ sacrificed for our sins when he is baptized. Thus he says,—

"They who diligently treat of that passage in the Epistle to the Hebrews, 'There remaineth no more sacrifice for sin,' do not understand it as spoken of the sacrifice of a heart contrite with penitence, but of the sacrifice of which the Apostle was then speaking, that is, the sacrifice of the Lord's passion, *which every one then offers for his sins, when he is dedicated in the faith of the same passion, and is baptized in the name of the Christian faithful:* the Apostle signifying this, that he who has sinned after baptism cannot be cleansed by being baptized again."[2]

But it is clear that Augustine did not mean anything more by this offering up of Christ, than a spiritual act, an act of faith.

Again, as Chrysostom speaks of the Eucharist as *an awful mystery, to be contemplated with fear and dread*, as Archdeacon Wilberforce reminds us,[3] so does he speak of Baptism. After having, in one of his homilies on the first Epistle to the Corinthians, which were preached publicly at Antioch, said concerning Baptism, "I am desirous of speaking plainly, but I dare "not on account of the uninitiated, for they make the explana- "tion difficult to us, compelling us either not to speak plainly,

[1] Wilb. On the Euch. p. 379, (or) 3rd ed. p. 327.

[2] Nam et illud ad Hebræos qui diligentius pertractant, sic intelligunt, ut non de sacrificio contribulati per pœnitentiam cordis accipiendum sit quod dictum est, "Non adhuc pro peccatis relinquitur sacrificium;" sed de sacrificio de quo tunc loquebatur Apostolus, id est, holocausto Dominicæ passionis, quod eo tempore offert quisque pro peccatis suis, quo ejusdem passionis fide dedicatur, et Christianorum fidelium nomine baptizatus imbuitur: ut hoc significaverit Apostolus, non posse deinceps eum qui peccaverit, iterum baptizando purgari. August. Expos. Epist. ad Rom. § 19. Op. ed. cit. iii. Pt. 2. col. 682.

[3] Wilb. On the Euch. p. 384, (or) 3rd ed. p. 331.

" or to bring before them things that ought not to be made " public," he adds,—" After the utterance of those mystic and " *fearful* words, and the *dreadful* rules of the doctrines brought " down from heaven, we lastly, when we are about to baptize, " add this, namely, that we direct them to say, 'I believe in " the resurrection of the dead,' " &c.[1]

And so elsewhere he speaks of one about to be baptized as being " about to approach those sacred and awful mysteries."[2]

(26.) *Against the doctrine of Transubstantiation in particular the Fathers clearly testify, that the elements remain the same in their nature and substance after consecration, and that they give bodily nourishment to those who partake of them.*

The evidence already adduced from the Fathers against the doctrine of a real presence of the body and blood of Christ in or under the elements, of course applies to the tenet of Transubstantiation, which is but *one form* of that doctrine. But against this particular form of it much *additional* evidence might be given.

It is not, however, my purpose, on the present occasion, to enter at large into the mass of proofs that occur in the writings of the Fathers, that they did not hold the Romish doctrine of Transubstantiation. Dr. Pusey is clear and distinct in his repudiation of the doctrine, and has given various passages from the Fathers to show that they did not hold it. Archdeacon Denison denies any sympathy with it, though referring to the work of Archdeacon Wilberforce on the Eucharist as one that accurately expresses his views on the subject; and certainly in that work the doctrine of Transubstantiation, though not advocated, is anything but repudiated. In fact it is expressly *reserved for consideration*, and since the publication of the work the Author has passed over to the Church of Rome, where its acceptance is, of course, necessary to his position.

As it respects Archdeacon Wilberforce, the works I have

[1] Μετὰ γὰρ τὴν ἀπαγγελίαν τῶν μυστικῶν ῥημάτων ἐκείνων καὶ φοβερῶν, καὶ τοὺς φρικτοὺς κανόνας τῶν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ κατενεχθέντων δογμάτων, καὶ τοῦτο πρὸς τῷ τέλει προστίθεμεν, ὅταν μέλλωμεν βαπτίζειν, κελεύοντες λέγειν· κ. τ. λ. CHRYSOST. In Epist. 1. ad Corinth. hom. 40. § 1. Op. ed. cit. tom. x. p. 379.

[2] Τοῖς ἱεροῖς τούτοις καὶ φρικτοῖς μέλλοντα προσιέναι μυστηρίοις. ID. Ad illum. catech. i. § 2. Op. ii. 227.

proposed to answer are those published by him when in the communion of our Church, where of course the doctrine of Transubstantiation could not be *formally* maintained.

And my more especial object in this work is to oppose that doctrine of a real presence of the substance of Christ's body and blood in the consecrated sacramental substances, or to the bodies of the communicants, in a spiritual and immaterial form, which has been advocated by the Authors under review as consistent, in at least one of its varieties, with the language of our authorised Formularies; and of which the particular doctrine of Transubstantiation is only one of the forms.

I shall therefore confine myself here to giving a few extracts from the Fathers on the two points above referred to, namely, that the elements remain the same in their nature and substance after consecration, and that they give bodily nourishment to those who partake of them; which are amply sufficient to prove the point in question to all open to conviction.

(*a.*) The elements remain the same in their nature and substance after consecration.

Among the various Authors that might be referred to on this point I would direct the reader more especially to three that are clear and express.

First, Theodoret, who, in a passage already quoted,[1] says, that our Lord "honoured the visible symbols with the appellation of his body and blood, not having changed their nature, but having added grace to nature."

And again he says,—

"For neither after the consecration are the mystic symbols deprived of their proper nature. For they remain in their former substance and figure and form, and are visible and tangible as they were before."[2]

Similarly Gelasius says, that in the sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ "there ceases not to be the substance or

[1] See p. 248 above.

[2] Οὐδε γὰρ μετὰ τὸν αγιασμὸν τὰ μυστικὰ σύμβολα τῆς οἰκείας ἐξίσταται φύσεως· μένει γὰρ ἐπὶ τῆς προτέρας οὐσίας, καὶ τοῦ σχήματος, καὶ τοῦ εἴδους, καὶ ὁρατά ἐστι, καὶ ἁπτὰ, οἷα καὶ πρότερον ἦν. THEODORET. Dial. 2. *vocat.* Inconfusus. Op. iv. 126.

nature of bread or wine," and that the elements "remain in their own proper nature."[1]

It is perhaps worthy of notice, that the celebrated Romish controversialist, Cardinal Alan, admitted that these two Fathers granted that the matter of the element [bread] remained.[2]

The third Author is Chrysostom, who speaks thus:—

"Before the bread is consecrated, we call it bread; but when divine grace has sanctified it, through the intervention of the priest, it is freed from the name, bread, and is thought worthy to be called the Lord's body, though *the nature of bread remains in it*."[3]

To the same effect speak many of the passages already quoted under former heads in this section; and it would be easy to add to them to almost any extent.

"What ye see [upon the table]," says Augustine, "is bread."[4]

"At the Divine table," says the Council of Nice, "let us not fix our thoughts downcast on *the bread* that lies before us, and the cup."[5]

And to these should be added the evidence derived from the nature of the argument frequently used by the Fathers against the heretics that denied that our Lord had a material body, and held that his apparent body was only the external appearance of a body without its materiality. A common argument of the Fathers against this heresy was, that our Lord must certainly have had a real material body, because in the Eucharist

[1] Certe sacramenta quæ sumimus corporis et sanguinis Christi, divina res est, propter quod et per eadem divinæ efficimur consortes naturæ, et tamen esse non desinit substantia vel natura panis vel vini . . . . permanent in suæ proprietate naturæ. GELAS. De duab. nat. in Christo. Inter Scripta Vet. Lat. ed. Simler. Tigur. 1571. fol. 84.

[2] CARD. ALAN. De Euchar. Sacr. lib. i. c. 35.

[3] Antequam sanctificetur panis, panem nominamus : divina autem illum sanctificante gratia, mediante sacerdote, liberatus est quidem ab appellatione panis, dignus autem habitus Dominici corporis appellatione, etiamsi natura panis in ipso permansit. CHRYSOST. Ep. ad Cæsarium. Op. iii. 744. The genuineness of this Epistle, though cavilled at by some of the Romanists, rests on as good authority as that of any of the other works of Chrysostom.

[4] Quod videtis [*i. e.* in mensa] panis est. AUGUST. Serm. 272. Op. v. 1103.

[5] Ἐπὶ τῆς θείας τραπέζης παλιν κἀνταῦθα, μὴ τῷ προσκειμένῳ ἄρτῳ, καὶ τῷ ποτηρίῳ ταπεινῶς προσέχωμεν. CONCIL. NIC. Inter Gelasii Cyzic. Comment. Act. Conc. Nic. Pt. 2. c. 31. Ed. Lutet. 1599. p. 173.

bread and wine were appointed to represent it.[1] But if the Fathers had held, like the Romanists, that what represented the body of Christ was only the accidents of the bread without the substance, the argument would have told the other way, for the representation would have been precisely that which was suitable to shadow forth a body such as that which these heretics attributed to our Lord.

(*b.*) The consecrated sacramental substances give bodily nourishment to those who partake of them.

On this point it is not necessary to bring evidence, because (with exceptions not worth noticing) it is granted on all hands that such is the case, and that the Fathers held it to be so.

If, therefore, the doctrine of Transubstantiation is true, we must suppose, that the *accidents* of bread and wine when the substance is gone, (supposing it possible that accidents can exist without their subject,) that is the form, colour, &c., devoid of all substance, can give bodily nourishment. If this is not a *reductio ad absurdum*, it is difficult to conceive that there can be such a thing as an absurdity. And therefore here we may fairly leave the argument.

But, as usual, the resort is to the supposition of *a miracle* to solve the difficulty. And certainly there is a *dignus vindice nodus* to make this more than ordinarily necessary. "Even the species [or, accidents] of the sacrament," says Bellarmine, "would nourish, if taken in a large quantity; for as BY A DIVINE MIRACLE they remain without a subject, so also, they nourish, as divines teach."[2] Alas! for the absurdities which "divines" will sometimes "teach."

To maintain their doctrine of Transubstantiation, therefore, they have to imagine, without the slightest authority from Holy Scripture, the performance of two miracles, each of which is like causing two and two to become five; namely, first, that the accidents of bread and wine remain suspended in the air when their substance is gone; and secondly, that these accidents, "if taken

[1] See, for instance, TERTULL. Adv. Marc. iv. 40; and v. 8.

[2] Etiam species sacramenti nutrirent, si in magna copia sumerentur: sicut enim divino miraculo manent sine subjecto, ita etiam nutriunt, ut theologi docent. BELLARM. De Euchar. lib. iii. c. 23. Op. ed. cit. tom. iii. col. 640.

in a large quantity," received into the body, give it nourishment! It would have been well if Bellarmine had told us how much he meant by a "large quantity" of such accidents.

It is right to add, that other divines of the Church of Rome have accounted for the matter in a way somewhat different from that adopted by Bellarmine, but with as little reason.

But such egregious trifling with the common sense of mankind does not deserve further notice.

It has been justly said by our learned and able Bishop Jeremy Taylor, when noticing these Romish phantasms of argument, that the Romanists "deal with mankind" "as if all their disciples were babies or fools, and that to them it is lawful to say anything, and having no understanding of their own, they are to efform them as they please."[1]

(27.) *The change which some of the Fathers speak of as taking place in the Eucharistic elements on consecration is described by them in terms of the same kind as those in which they speak of a change taking place on consecration in the water of baptism, and in the chrism; and therefore, apparently, was not supposed to be more than a change of character, use, and effect, and certainly not such a change as to make the body and blood of Christ constitute with them, or their forms, one compound whole.*

The passages above-quoted from the Fathers have, I trust, made it tolerably evident, that they cannot be justly referred to as maintaining, that the real body and blood of Christ form part of the consecrated sacramental substances, either as *substituted* for the substance of the bread and wine, and lying hid under their forms, according to the doctrine of *Transubstantiation*, or as *united with* the bread and wine so as to form one compound whole with them, according to the doctrine of *Consubstantiation*. If the *consecrated substances* as *received and eaten* are signs and symbols of the body and blood of Christ, if the body of Christ is absent from the earth and can only be in one place, if the other propositions which I have endeavoured to show are maintained by the Fathers are admitted; then the real body and blood of Christ are not any part of that which is put into *the mouth* of the communicant.

[1] Bp. Taylor, Real Presence, Sec. xi. § 22.

But I admit, that language is used by some of the Fathers, which, taken by itself, apart from any consideration of the nature of the phraseology in use with them in such matters, might seem to imply, that a certain virtue or efficacy, such as is supposed to exist in the flesh and blood of Christ, is imparted to the bread and wine by the operation of the Holy Spirit upon them. What purpose such a change could answer, when it is admitted that the inward part or *res sacramenti* is food only for the soul, it is difficult to see; because whatever virtue or efficacy may be introduced into the food received by the mouth, if that virtue does not act upon the body, and is food only for the soul, to be received by the soul only by faith, the soul receives no benefit by its union with the food eaten by the mouth; for faith has no better opportunity for feeding on anything lying in the stomach than if it was in heaven.

But I omit all considerations of this kind for the present, because here I am merely inquiring what the language of the Fathers would lead us to suppose was their view in this matter. And I freely admit, that there is language to be found in *some* of them, which, *taken alone*, might seem to imply, that they did consider this to be the case. But when I compare that language with the language of the same Authors with respect to the water of baptism, and other things, I am unable to think that they meant anything more, than that there was a change in the *character* and *use* and *effects* of the elements produced by consecration; because they use *the same terms* as to the *change of the water* when consecrated for the purpose of baptism, and the change of other things, on consecration, as they do with reference to the change of the bread and wine when consecrated for the purpose of the Holy Communion.

And we must observe, that this notion of a virtual presence, that is, a presence by the transfusion of the virtue or power of the body and blood of Christ into the bread and wine, is altogether different from the doctrine of the Real Presence maintained by the Authors under review, and is in fact as much opposed by them as the doctrine of a symbolical presence in the elements.

So that, whatever conclusion we might come to with respect

to the meaning of these passages in the Fathers, the doctrine resulting would afford no countenance to the doctrine of the Authors under review.

Nay more; these passages, in which the expressions might seem to favor a *virtual* presence, are very good evidences, in whatever way they may be interpreted, that their authors did not at least hold that doctrine of the Real Presence which I am here opposing, because these two notions are irreconcileable with each other.

I now proceed, then, to point out passages in some of the Fathers which might seem to indicate the infusion into the elements themselves, or at least the annexation to them, of a certain virtue and efficacy, effected through consecration by the power of the Holy Spirit; and I shall connect with them passages in which they speak in similar terms of the effect produced in the same way on the water of baptism.

I take first Cyril of Alexandria.

He tells us that—

"The smallest piece of that which has been consecrated in the Eucharist commingles our whole body with itself, and fills it with *its own energy*." [1]

And again elsewhere in a passage which is worth special observation in this matter, he says:—

"That we might not be shocked seeing flesh and blood lying on the sacred Tables of our Churches, God, condescending to our infirmities, imparts to the substances on the Table *the power of life*, and changes them *into the efficacy of his own flesh*, that we might have them for a life-giving participation, and that the body of life might be found as a life-giving seed within us. And doubt not that this is true, as he clearly says, 'This is my body,' and, 'This is my blood;' but rather receive in faith the word of the Saviour; for being Truth, he does not lie." [2]

[1] Ολιγίστη εὐλογία σύμπαν ἡμῶν εἰς ἑαυτὴν ἀναφύρει τὸ σῶμα, καὶ τῆς ἰδίας ἐνεργείας ἀναπληροῖ. Cyrill. Alex. In Johan. lib. iv. (in c. vi. v. 57.) Op. iv. 365.

[2] "Ινα μὴ ἀποναρκήσωμεν σάρκά τε καὶ αἷμα προκείμενα βλέποντες ἐν ἁγίαις τραπέζαις ἐκκλησιῶν, συγκαθιστάμενος ὁ Θεὸς ταῖς ἡμετέραις ἀσθενείαις ἐνίησι τοῖς προκειμένοις δύναμιν ζωῆς, καὶ μεθίστησιν αὐτὰ πρὸς ἐνέργειαν τῆς ἑαυτοῦ σαρκὸς· ἵνα εἰς μέθεξιν ζωοποιὸν ἔχωμεν αὐτά, καὶ οἷον σπέρμα ζωοποιὸν ἐν ἡμῖν εὑρεθῇ τὸ σῶμα τῆς ζωῆς· καὶ μὴ ἀμφιβάλῃς, ὅτι τοῦτο ἐστὶν ἀληθὲς, αὐτοῦ λέγοντος ἐναργῶς, Τοῦτο, κ. τ. λ. Id. Comment. in Luc. c. xxii. v. 19. Inter Nova Biblioth. Patr. ed. Mai. Rom. 1844. tom. ii. p. 417.

It is admitted by Dr. Pusey, that Cyril here speaks "of the change in the Eucharistic elements, not into the Body and Blood of Christ, but into the *energy* or *virtue* of that Body and Blood;" and he candidly says, that "the 'energy,' 'operation,' 'power' of an operative substance is not the same as that substance itself;" and he extracts his own doctrine out of the passage by the following explanation:—"The Eucharistic symbols, as sym-"bols, are, by consecration, 'translated into the power of' the "Body and Blood of Christ, because they are outward parts, "through and under which that Body and Blood are present and "are conveyed. But the very words express, that the outward "part is distinct from the inward."[1]

Now *the principle* of interpretation here adopted by Dr. Pusey, I do not object to, but it applies better in favor of the doctrine for which I contend than for that of Dr. Pusey. For the symbols may be considered as translated into the power of the Body and Blood, because they are *made instrumentally the means* by which the faithful partake of the Body and Blood. And I agree with Dr. Pusey, that "the very words express, that the outward part is distinct from the inward," and therefore I argue, that the two things are not here supposed to be so conjoined as to form but one compound whole.

And the same Father speaks elsewhere in similar terms of the water of Baptism.

After observing that man is composed of two parts, a body and a soul, and that he therefore needs a twofold remedy for his regeneration, suited respectively to each part, he adds,—

"For by the Spirit the soul of man is sanctified, but on the other hand by the sanctified water the body. For just as water poured into kettles when brought into contact with the heat of the fire receives into itself the power that proceeds from it, thus by the powerful working of the Spirit the sensible water is *transelemented*[2]

[1] Pusey's Doct. of Real Presence, &c. pp. 175, 176.

[2] I give that translation of the word μεταστοιχειοῦται which is insisted on by Roman Catholic writers when it is used respecting the eucharistic bread and wine, and I observe that this translation is given in this passage by Dr. Pusey (Doctr. of Real Pres., p. 208), who evidently thinks however (and I agree with him) that in both cases "*transform*" would be a more correct translation, and of ἀναστοιχειόω "*re-form.*" But those who insist upon its meaning *transelement* in one case must accept it in the same sense in the other.

*into a certain divine and unspeakable power*, and thenceforth sanctifies those to whom it may be applied."[1]

Again, Theodoret, in a passage already quoted,[2] says that Christ "honoured the visible symbols with the name of his body and blood, not having changed their nature, but having *added grace to nature*."

But the same Father elsewhere, explaining why things are called by the names of the effects produced by them, observes, "Thus baptism is called living water, not because the water of baptism has a different nature from other water, but because by that water Divine grace gives eternal life."[3]

There is also a passage in Gregory Nyssen, which is well worthy of observation as illustrating the point on which we are now speaking.

Speaking of baptism, he says, "The water does not confer this benefit, but the ordination of God and the supervention of the Spirit....but the water serves to exhibit the purification."[4] And then proceeding to speak of the work of the Spirit in Baptism, he says,—"the Spirit blesses the body baptised, and the water that baptises. Wherefore you must not despise the Divine laver, nor make light of it as common, on account of the use of water.[5] For it works great things," &c. And he then parallels the change produced on the water by consecration with that produced on *the stone of the altar* by consecration, which is thereafter sacred for holy purposes. And he then immediately adds,—"*The bread* likewise "is originally common bread, but when the mystery has conse- "crated it, it is called and becomes the body of Christ. *Thus*

[1] Πνεύματι μὲν γὰρ ἁγιάζεται τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τὸ πνεῦμα, ὕδατι δὲ αὖ πάλιν ἡγιασμένῳ τὸ σῶμα. Ὅνπερ γὰρ τρόπον τὸ ἐν τοῖς λέβησιν ἐκχεόμενον ὕδωρ ταῖς τοῦ πυρὸς ὁμιλῆσαν ἀκμαῖς τὴν ἐξ αὐτοῦ δύναμιν ἀναμάττεται, οὕτω διὰ τῆς τοῦ Πνεύματος ἐνεργείας τὸ αἰσθητὸν ὕδωρ πρὸς θείαν τινὰ καὶ ἄῤῥητον ἀναστοιχειοῦται (al. μεταστοιχειοῦται) δύναμιν, ἁγιάζει τε λοιπὸν τοὺς ἐν οἷς ἂν γένοιτο. CYRILL. ALEX. Comment. in Joann. c. vi. v. 5. Op. ed. cit. tom. iv. p. 147.

[2] See p. 248 above.

[3] Οὕτως ὕδωρ ζῶν καλεῖται τὸ βάπτισμα· οὐκ ἐπειδὴ φύσιν ἑτέραν ἔχει τοῦ βαπτίσματος ὕδωρ, ἀλλ' ὅτι δι' ἐκείνου τοῦ ὕδατος ἡ θεία χάρις τὴν αἰώνιον δωρεῖται ζωήν. THEODORET. Quæst. in Genes. quæst. 26. Op. tom. i. p. 41.

[4] Πρὸς ἔνδειξιν τῆς καθάρσεως.

[5] Μηδὲ ὡς κοινὸν αὐτὸ ἐξευτελίσῃς, διὰ τὴν χρῆσιν τοῦ ὕδατος.

" *the mystic oil, thus the wine,* though they are of little value " previous to the benediction, after the sanctification which " proceeds from the Spirit, each of them works in a superior " way."[1] But in none of these cases, to which the change in the bread and wine is compared, is the change anything more than a change of character and use.

In the same terms also Cyril of Jerusalem speaks both of the water of baptism and of the sacred ointment, himself comparing the change in the ointment to the change in the bread; but nevertheless speaks of our body as a partaker of the sensible element only, and of the soul alone as a partaker of the spiritual influence. He tells us, that " the simple water having received " power [or, virtue] on the invocation of the Holy Spirit and " Christ, obtains sanctity. For since the nature of man is twofold, " consisting of body and soul, the purification is also twofold. " That which is immaterial is cleansed by that which is imma- " terial; that which is bodily by that which is bodily; the water " cleanses the body, the spirit seals the soul."[2]

But the context of these words shows, that he does not mean that there is any junction of grace or virtue with the water itself, so that the two things are joined together, either with or without fusion, as one whole; for he had said just before, " Come not to the font as to simple water, but to the spiritual grace *given with the water;*"[3] where the grace is spoken of as separate from the water; and he holds it to be given to the soul only.

So also with respect to the chrism which was used after baptism, it is said, in a work attributed to him, and quoted as his by Archdeacon Wilberforce,—

" But see that you do not look upon it as if it was *mere ointment*,

[1] Ὁ ἄρτος πάλιν ἄρτος ἐστὶ τέως κοινός· ἀλλ' ὅταν αὐτὸν τὸ μυστήριον ἱερουργήσῃ, σῶμα Χριστοῦ λέγεταί τε καὶ γίνεται· οὕτως τὸ μυστικὸν ἔλαιον, οὕτως ὁ οἶνος, ὀλίγου τινὸς ἄξια ὄντα πρὸ τῆς εὐλογίας, μετὰ τὸν ἁγιασμὸν τὸν τοῦ Πνεύματος ἑκάτερον αὐτῶν ἐνεργεῖ διαφόρως. GREGOR. NYSS. In baptism. Christi. Op. Paris. 1615. tom. ii. pp. 801, 802.

[2] Τὸ λιτὸν ὕδωρ Πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ Χριστοῦ πρὸς τὴν ἐπίκλησιν λαβὸν δύναμιν ἁγιότητος ἐπικτᾶται. Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ διπλοῦς ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐκ ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος συγκείμενος, διπλοῦν καὶ τὸ καθάρσιον· τὸ μὲν ἀσώματον τῷ ἀσωμάτῳ· τὸ δὲ σωματικὸν τῷ σώματι· καὶ τὸ μὲν ὕδωρ καθαίρει τὸ σῶμα, τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα σφραγίζει τὴν ψυχήν. CYRILL. HIEROSOL. Catech. 3. § 2. Op. ed. Oxon. 1703. p. 35.

[3] Μὴ ὡς ὕδατι λιτῷ πρόσελθε τῷ λουτρῷ· ἀλλὰ τῇ μετὰ τοῦ ὕδατος διδομένῃ πνευματικῇ χάριτι. ID. ib. pp. 34, 35.

For *as the bread of the Eucharist*, after the invocation of the Holy Spirit, is no longer simple bread, but the body of Christ, *so also that holy ointment* is no longer simple, nor as one might say common ointment after invocation, but the charisma of Christ, and by the presence of the Holy Spirit brings his divinity into operation .... and by the visible ointment the body is anointed, but by the holy and life-giving Spirit the soul is sanctified."[1]

Hence we may explain the following passage in the same author, where he says,—

"We entreat the most gracious God to send down his Holy Spirit on the things that lie before him; that he may make the bread the body of Christ, and the wine the blood of Christ. For whatever is any way touched by the Holy Spirit is sanctified and changed."[2]

The change here alluded to is evidently the same as that which is supposed to pass on the water and the ointment.

And in another passage the same writer compares the change that takes place in the bread and wine on consecration, to that which takes place in the meat offered to evil spirits after the invocation of the evil spirits. He says,—

"For as the bread and wine of the Eucharist, before the sacred invocation of the adorable Trinity, was mere bread and wine, but after the invocation the bread becomes the body of Christ and the wine the blood of Christ; *exactly in the same manner* such meats of the pomp of the devil [i.e. those offered to evil spirits at heathen festivals], being in their own nature unadulterated, become through the invocation of evil spirits impure."[3]

[1] Ἀλλ' ὅρα μὴ ὑπονοήσῃς ἐκεῖνο τὸ μύρον ψιλὸν εἶναι· ὥσπερ καὶ (γὰρ *alii*) ὁ ἄρτος τῆς εὐχαριστίας, μετὰ τὴν ἐπίκλησιν τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος, οὐκ ἔτι ἄρτος λιτὸς, ἀλλὰ σῶμα Χριστοῦ· οὕτω καὶ τὸ ἅγιον τοῦτο μύρον οὐκ ἔτι ψιλὸν, οὐδ', ὡς ἂν εἴποι τις, κοινὸν, μετ' ἐπίκλησιν, ἀλλὰ Χριστοῦ χάρισμα, καὶ Πνεύματος ἁγίου παρουσίᾳ τῆς αὐτοῦ θεότητος ἐνεργητικὸν γινόμενον, ὅπερ συμβολικῶς ἐπὶ μετώπου καὶ τῶν ἄλλων σου χρίηται αἰσθητηρίων. Καὶ τῷ μὲν φαινομένῳ μύρῳ τὸ σῶμα χρίεται, τῷ δὲ ἀγίῳ καὶ ζωοποιῷ Πνεύματι ἡ ψυχὴ ἁγιάζεται. Pseudo-Cyrill. Hieros. Catech. Mystag. iii. § 3. ib. pp. 289, 290.

[2] Παρακαλῶμεν τὸν φιλάνθρωπον Θεὸν, τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα ἐξαποστεῖλαι ἐπὶ τὰ προκείμενα, ἵνα ποίησῃ, τὸν μὲν ἄρτον, σῶμα Χριστοῦ, τὸν δὲ οἶνον, αἷμα Χριστοῦ. Πάντως γὰρ οὗ ἐὰν ἐφάψαιτο τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα, τοῦτο ἡγίασται καὶ μεταβέβληται. Id. Catech. Mystag. v. § 5. ib. p. 297.

[3] Ὥσπερ γὰρ ὁ ἄρτος καὶ ὁ οἶνος τῆς εὐχαριστίας, πρὸ τῆς ἁγίας ἐπικλήσεως τῆς προσκυνητῆς Τριάδος, ἄρτος ἦν καὶ οἶνος λιτὸς, ἐπικλήσεως δὲ γενομένης, ὁ μὲν ἄρτος γίνεται σῶμα Χριστοῦ, ὁ δὲ οἶνος αἷμα Χριστοῦ· τὸν αὐτὸν δὴ τρόπον τὰ τοιαῦτα βρώματα τῆς πομπῆς τοῦ Σατανᾶ τῇ ἰδίᾳ φύσει λιτὰ ὄντα, τῇ ἐπικλήσει τῶν δαιμόνων βέβηλα γίνεται. Id. Catech. Mystag. i. § 4. ib. p. 281.

This again illustrates the nature of the change he supposed to pass upon the bread and wine.

Let us pass on to Chrysostom.

Passing over, for the present, the passages quoted from him to prove a complete transformation of the elements into the body and blood of Christ,[1] I would observe, that there are others in which he clearly seems to speak of the change being effected by a gift of grace being connected with them through the operation of the Holy Spirit, and he uses the same language with respect to the water of baptism.

Thus, after speaking, in the style of language in which he delighted, of our "seeing the Lord sacrificed and lying [on the Lord's table] ... and all the people red with that precious blood," he adds the following words :—

"For the priest stands, not bringing down fire, but the Holy Spirit; and makes long supplication, not that some torch descending from above may consume the things lying before him, but that *grace* having descended upon the sacrifice, may, through it, light up the souls of all."[2]

Here we see what the prayer offered really meant, and therefore what was looked for in the Eucharist.

Again elsewhere he says,—

"When the priest stands before the Table, lifting up his hands to heaven, invoking the Holy Spirit to come and touch the things lying before him, there is great stillness, a deep silence. When the Spirit has given *the grace*, when he has descended, when he has touched the things lying on the table, when you see the sheep slain and perfectly prepared, then do you introduce tumult, disturbance, contention, and revilings?"[3]

[1] I shall notice, in Sections 4 and 5 of this Chapter, the terms quoted from him and some other Fathers to prove that they maintained this.

[2] "Εστηκε γὰρ ὁ ἱερεὺς, οὐ πῦρ καταφέρων, ἀλλὰ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον· καὶ τὴν ἱκετηρίαν ἐπὶ πολὺ ποιεῖται, οὐχ ἵνα τις λαμπὰς ἄνωθεν ἀφεθεῖσα καταναλώσῃ τὰ προκείμενα· ἀλλ' ἵνα ἡ χάρις ἐπιπεσοῦσα τῇ θυσίᾳ, δι' ἐκείνης τὰς ἁπάντων ἀνάψῃ ψυχάς. CHRYS. De sacerd. lib. iii. § 4. Op. i. 383.

[3] "Οταν ἑστήκῃ πρὸ τῆς τραπέζης ὁ ἱερεὺς, τὰς χεῖρας ἀνατείνων εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν, καλῶν τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, τοῦ παραγένεσθαι καὶ ἅψασθαι τῶν προκειμένων, πολλὴ ἡσυχία, πολλὴ σιγή. "Οταν διδῷ τὴν χάριν τὸ Πνεῦμα, ὅταν κατέλθῃ, ὅταν ἅψηται τῶν προκειμένων, ὅταν ἴδῃς τὸ πρόβατον ἐσφαγιασμένον καὶ ἀπηρτισμένον, τότε θόρυβον, τότε ταραχὴν, τότε φιλονεικίαν, τότε λοιδορίαν ἐπεισάγεις; ID. Hom. de Cœmet. § 3. Op. ii. 401.

Here again what was prayed for, and what was considered as given, was *a gift of grace* by the illapse of the Holy Spirit upon the elements.

And similarly elsewhere, speaking of our enjoyment of "the grace of the Spirit," God having given to us, according to the Apostle, "the earnest of the Spirit" (2 Cor. v. 5.), and observing that "many indications of that gift [i. e. the grace of the Spirit] still remain to us,"[1] he says,—

"For if there was not the earnest of the Spirit even now, baptism could not exist, there could not be remission of sins, there could not be righteousness and sanctification, we could not have received the adoption of sons, we could not have enjoyed the mysteries; for the mystical body and blood could not be without the grace of the Spirit."[2]

Now these passages might doubtless be interpreted as implying that the elements themselves were acted upon by the Holy Spirit so as to *imbibe* a Divine power and efficacy; but certainly they are not expressed in the terms we should look for from one who held that doctrine of the Real Presence maintained by the Authors under review. And as it respects the former interpretation, we here again find, that Chrysostom, like the other Fathers just referred to, uses the same language with respect to the water of baptism. He speaks of the water of baptism *receiving the grace of the Spirit* to render it effectual, when he evidently meant only to intimate that the grace accompanies the use of the water. "The water," he says, "does not work by itself; but when it *receives the grace of the Spirit*, then it washes away all sins."[3] And elsewhere, in very similar language, he speaks of the water of baptism as giving life.[4]

What he means is very clear from another passage, where, after observing that "a mystery is so called because it is not

[1] Πολλὰ ἔτι καὶ νῦν μένει τῆς δωρεᾶς ἐκείνης σύμβολα.

[2] Εἰ γὰρ μὴ ἦν ἀρραβὼν τοῦ Πνεύματος καὶ νῦν, οὐκ ἂν συνέστη τὸ βάπτισμα, οὐκ ἂν ἁμαρτημάτων ἄφεσις ἐγένετο, οὐκ ἂν δικαιοσύνη καὶ ἁγιασμὸς, οὐκ ἂν υἱοθεσίαν ἐλάβομεν, οὐκ ἂν μυστηρίων ἀπελαύσαμεν· σῶμα γὰρ καὶ αἷμα μυστικὸν οὐκ ἄν ποτε γένοιτο τῆς τοῦ Πνεύματος χάριτος χωρὶς. Id. Hom. De Resurrect. § 8. Op. ii. 435, 436.

[3] Οὐχ ἁπλῶς τὸ ὕδωρ ἐργάζεται, ἀλλ' ὅταν τὴν τοῦ Πνεύματος δέξηται χάριν, τότε πάντα λύει τὰ ἁμαρτήματα. Chrysost. Comment. in Johan. hom. xxxvi. § 1. Op. viii. 207.

[4] Εἰπέ μοι οὖν, ὦ Ἰουδαῖε, πῶς τὸ ὕδωρ τὸ ἐπὶ τοῦ βαπτίσματος δύο ἐνεργείας ἔχει, καὶ τὸν μὲν πνίγει, τὸν δὲ ζωοποιεῖ. Id. Homil. de Beato Abraham, § 3. Op. ii. 747.

" what we see that our faith looks upon, but we see one thing,
" and our faith is directed to another; for such is the nature of
" our mysteries; and therefore I and an unbeliever are dif-
" ferently affected with regard to these things:"—he adds,—
" He [an unbeliever] hearing of the laver [of baptism], thinks
" it to be water only; but I do not look only upon that which is
" seen, but on the purification of the soul that is effected by the
" Spirit. He thinks only that my body is washed, but I believe
" that my soul also is made pure and holy. . . . . I hear of the
" body of Christ; I understand what is said in one way, the
" unbeliever in another." [1]

The same language is used by Theodotus, who, though a Valentinian, did not differ in the doctrine of the Eucharist from the orthodox. He says,—

" Moreover the bread *and the oil* are sanctified by the power of the name, *not being the same*, according to the appearance, as they were when taken, but they are *changed* by power into a spiritual power. So also *the water*, both that which is exorcised and that which is used for baptism, not only gives place in itself to that which is impure, but also receives the addition of sanctification." [2]

No other change of the bread, therefore, is admitted but one that endues it with a certain spiritual power; and the same change is affirmed of the consecrated oil, and the water of baptism.

In similar terms speaks Epiphanius:—

" For here in Christ," he says, " *the power of the bread and the force of the water* are made strong; not that the bread may be power to us, but the power of the bread; the bread indeed is for food, but the power that is in it is for vivification: and not that the water may cleanse us only, but that by *the force of the water*, through faith and activity and hope and the performance of the

[1] Καὶ ἄλλως δὲ μυστήριον καλεῖται· ὅτι οὐχ ἅπερ ὁρῶμεν πιστεύομεν, ἀλλ' ἕτερα ὁρῶμεν, καὶ ἕτερα πιστεύομεν· τοιαύτη γὰρ ἡ τῶν μυστηρίων ἡμῶν φύσις· ἑτέρως γοῦν ἐγὼ, καὶ ἑτέρως ὁ ἄπιστος περὶ τούτων διακείμεθα. . . . . Ἀκούων λουτρὸν ἐκεῖνος, ἁπλῶς ὕδωρ νομίζει· ἐγὼ δὲ οὐ τὸ ὁρώμενον ἁπλῶς βλέπω, ἀλλὰ τὸν τῆς ψυχῆς καθαρμὸν τὸν διὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος. Ἐκεῖνος λελοῦσθαι μοι τὸ σῶμα νομίζει μόνον· ἐγὼ δὲ πεπίστευκα ὅτι καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ γέγονε καθαρά τε καὶ ἁγία. . . . . Ἀκούω σῶμα Χριστοῦ· ἑτέρως ἐγὼ νοῶ τὸ εἰρημένον, ἑτέρως ὁ ἄπιστος. CHRYS. In 1 Cor. (ii. 6, 7.) hom. vii. § 1. Op. x. 51.

[2] Καὶ ὁ ἄρτος καὶ τὸ ἔλαιον ἁγιάζεται τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ ὀνόματος, οὐ τὰ αὐτὰ ὄντα κατὰ τὸ φαινόμενον οἷα ἐλήφθη, ἀλλὰ δυνάμει εἰς δύναμιν πνευματικὴν μεταβέβληται. Οὕτως καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ καὶ ἐξορκιζόμενον καὶ τὸ βάπτισμα γινόμενον, οὐ μόνον χωρεῖ τὸ χεῖρον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἁγιασμὸν προσλαμβάνει. THEODOT. Excerpt. n. 82. Ad fin. Clem. Alex. Op. ed. cit. tom. ii. p. 988.

mysteries and the designation of consecration, it may bring us perfect salvation."[1]

Here again the only change recognized is one which affects the *power* of the bread, and it is put on the same footing as that which is supposed to take place in the water of baptism.

There is also a remarkable passage of a similar kind in Ephræm Patriarch of Antioch, preserved to us by Photius. He says, speaking of the union of the two natures in Christ,—

"So that Body of Christ which is taken by the faithful neither is deprived of that substance which is the object of sense, nor is separated from the grace which is an object to the mind. And spiritual baptism also, having become a complete whole and being one, both preserves the property of the substance which is an object to the senses, I mean the water, and does not lose that which it is made to be."[2]

Now whatever obscurity there may be in this, as to its precise meaning, one thing is clear, that no other change is supposed in the Eucharistic bread than what takes place in the water of baptism. And further, the gift of grace is not here spoken of as given to the substance which is the object of sense, but as morally not separated from it in the case of the faithful, or in the case of *spiritual* baptism. The gift is not said to be *contained in the external element*, but to be connected with it; which makes all the difference. And I must observe, by the way, that the term, *Body of Christ*, is here evidently applied to the Eucharistic symbol, in the way which we have had already to notice[3] in other Fathers; for that which is called the Body of Christ is supposed to have "substance which is the object of sense," and moreover the spiritual thing which is spoken of is "the *grace* which is an object to the mind."

[1] Ἐνταῦθα δὲ ἐν Χριστῷ ἰσχυροποιουμένων τῆς δυνάμεως τοῦ ἄρτου καὶ τῆς τοῦ ὕδατος ἰσχύος· ἵνα οὐκ ἄρτος ἡμῖν γένηται δύναμις, ἀλλὰ δύναμις ἄρτου. Καὶ βρῶσις μὲν ὁ ἄρτος, ἡ δὲ δύναμις ἐν αὐτῷ εἰς ζωογόνησιν. Καὶ οὐκ ἵνα τὸ ὕδωρ ἡμᾶς καθάρῃ μόνον, ἀλλ' ἵνα ἐν τῇ ἰσχύι τοῦ ὕδατος διὰ τῆς πίστεως, καὶ ἐνεργείας, καὶ ἐλπίδος, καὶ μυστηρίων τελειώσεως, καὶ ὀνομασίας τῆς ἁγιαστείας, γένηται ἡμῖν εἰς τελείωσιν σωτηρίας. Epiphan. Expos. fid. Cathol. ad fin. lib. iii. Op. Adv. hæres. Op. ed. Paris. 1622. tom. i. p. 1098.

[2] Οὕτω καὶ τὸ παρὰ τῶν πιστῶν λαμβανόμενον σῶμα Χριστοῦ, καὶ τῆς αἰσθητῆς οὐσίας οὐκ ἐξίσταται, καὶ τῆς νοητῆς ἀδιαίρετον μένει χάριτος· καὶ τὸ βάπτισμα δὲ πνευματικὸν, ὅλον γένομενον καὶ ἓν ὑπάρχον, καὶ τὸ ἴδιον τῆς αἰσθητῆς οὐσίας, τοῦ ὕδατος λέγω, διασώζει, καὶ ὃ γέγονεν οὐκ ἀπώλεσεν. Ephræm. Theopolit. ut cit. in Photii Biblioth. No. 228. ed. Rothom. 1653. col. 793.

[3] See pp. 241—243 and 247—249 above.

So Theophilus of Alexandria in one of his Paschal Letters, written a. 402, translated and commended by Jerome, parallels the sanctification of the water of Baptism by the Holy Spirit with His sanctification of the bread and wine in the Eucharist. Blaming Origen for saying (as he asserts [1]) that the Holy Spirit does not act upon inanimate things, and does not come to things that are irrational, he says,—

"In saying which, he does not consider, that the mystic waters in baptism are consecrated by the advent of the Holy Spirit; and that the bread of the Lord, by which the body of the Saviour is exhibited, and which we break for our sanctification, and the sacred cup (which are placed on the Table of the Church, and are certainly inanimate) are sanctified by the invocation and advent of the Holy Spirit." [2]

And so other Fathers speak as if the baptismal water itself was endued with a Divine power and energy.

Thus Tertullian says,—"For the Spirit comes over them "from heaven and rests upon the waters, sanctifying them from "himself; and the waters thus sanctified *imbibe the power of* "*sanctifying.*" [3]

So the Council of Nice, according to the account given us by Gelasius of Cyzicum, says,—"Do you see water? think of "the power of God *hidden in the water*.... Look upon the water "as *full of the sanctification of the Spirit and of Divine fire.*" [4]

So the Author of the work, "On the Sacraments," attributed to Ambrose, says of the water of baptism,—

"Not every water heals, but that water heals which *has the grace*

[1] He has not fairly represented Origen's sentiments.

[2] Dicit enim Spiritum Sanctum non operari ea quæ inanima sunt, nec ad irrationabilia pervenire. Quod asserens non recogitat, aquas in baptismate mysticas adventu Sancti Spiritus consecrari: Panemque Dominicum, quo Salvatoris Corpus ostenditur, et quem frangimus in sanctificationem nostri: et sacrum calicem (quæ in mensa Ecclesiæ collocantur et utique inanima sunt) per invocationem et adventum Sancti Spiritus sanctificari. THEOPHIL. ALEX. Paschal. 2. § 13. Inter Hieron. Epist. ep. 98. Op. i. 595.

[3] Supervenit enim statim Spiritus de cœlis, et aquis superest, sanctificans eas de semetipso; et ita sanctificatæ vim sanctificationis combibunt. TERTULL. de Bapt. c. 4. Op. ed. cit. p. 225.

[4] Ὕδωρ ὁρᾷς; νόησον τὸ ἐν τοῖς ὕδασι κρυπτομένην τοῦ Θεοῦ δύναμιν .... πλήρη τοῦ ἁγιασμοῦ τοῦ Πνεύματος καὶ τοῦ θείου πυρὸς νόει τὰ ὕδατα. CONCIL. NIC. Act. Comment. per Gelas. Cyzic. c. 31. ed. Lutet. 1590. pp. 172, 173.

*of Christ.* . . . The water does not heal, unless the Spirit descends and consecrates that water." [1]

So also Ammonius of Alexandria (fl. a. 220) says,—

"The water cleanses the body, and the Spirit sanctifies the invisible soul. The water acts in the place of a womb, and the Spirit in the place of the creating God. The sensible water is *re-elemented* into a divine power, and sanctifies those on whom it may come; the water differs from the Holy Spirit in thought only, for it is the same in its power and effect." [2]

And so Leo says,—"To every man being born again the water "of baptism is like the Virgin's womb, the same Holy Spirit "filling the font that filled the Virgin." [3] And again,—"The "birth which he took in the womb of the Virgin, he laid in the "font of baptism; he gave to the water what he gave to his "mother; for the power of the Highest and the overshadowing "of the Holy Spirit which caused Mary to bring forth the Sa-"viour, the same causes the water to regenerate the believer." [4]

And so Paulinus of Nola, speaking of baptism, says, that, by the operation of the Holy Spirit, "the water conceives God." [5]

These passages, then, seem abundantly to prove, that while the Fathers, no doubt, use language that might appear, viewed in itself, to imply that a Divine virtue and efficacy is infused into the bread and wine themselves, by which the blessed effects of the sacrament are produced, they also speak of the water of

[1] Non aqua omnis sanat; sed aqua sanat, quæ habet gratiam Christi. . . . Non sanat aqua, nisi Spiritus descenderit, et aquam illam consecraverit. Id. ib. lib. i. c. 5. ib. 352.

[2] Τὸ ὕδωρ καθαρίζει τὸ σῶμα, καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὴν ἀόρατον ἁγιάζει ψύχην. Τὸ ὕδωρ ἐν τάξει μητρὸς λαμβάνεται, τὸ δὲ Πνεῦμα ἐν τάξει τοῦ διαπλάττοντος Θεοῦ. Τὸ αἰσθητὸν ὕδωρ πρὸς θείαν ἀναστοιχειοῦται δύναμιν, καὶ ἁγιάζει τοὺς ἐν οἷς ἂν γένηται· τὸ ὕδωρ ἐπινοίᾳ μόνον διαφορὰν ἔχει πρὸς τὸ Πνεῦμα, ἐπεὶ ταὐτόν ἐστι τῇ ἐνεργείᾳ. Ammon. Alex. In Evang. Joann. c. iii. v. 5. Vide Catena Græc. Patr. in Joann. ed. Corderio. Antw. 1630. p. 89.

[3] Omni homini renascenti aqua baptismatis instar est uteri virginalis, eodem Spiritu Sancto replente fontem, qui replevit et Virginem. Leon. Magn. Serm. xxiv. In Nativ. Dom. 4. c. 3. Op. ed. Baller. tom. i. col. 80.

[4] Originem quam sumpsit in utero Virginis, posuit in fonte baptismatis; dedit aquæ quod dedit matri; virtus enim altissimi et obumbratio Spiritus Sancti quæ fecit ut Maria pareret Salvatorem, eadem facit ut regeneret unda credentem. Id. Serm. xxv. In Nativ. Dom. 5. c. 5. ib. col. 86.

[5] Sanctus in hunc cœlo descendit Spiritus amnem,
Cœlestique sacras fonte maritat aquas.
Concipit unda Deum: &c.
Paulin. Nol. Epist. ad Sever. ep. xxxii. (al. xii.) § 5. Op. ed. Paris. 1685. tom. i. p. 201.

baptism as being acted upon in a similar way and for a similar purpose.

Moreover these passages throw light upon the meaning of the words used by some of the Fathers to describe the change they attribute to the bread and wine. Much stress is laid by the Romanists, and to a certain extent by the Authors under review, on certain terms used by the Fathers to denote the way in which the bread and wine are changed on consecration.

They allege, and correctly, that the Fathers say, that the bread and wine are *changed* (μεταβάλλονται, mutantur,) and *converted* (μεθιστάσθαι, μετασκευαζέσθαι) into the body and blood of Christ; that they are *transformed* or *transfigured* (μεταῤῥυθμίζονται, transfigurantur), *transelemented* (μεταστοιχειοῦνται), and *transmade* (μεταποιοῦνται); according to their translation of the words.

These are the terms particularly referred to by a late Roman Catholic writer in the "Dublin Review," as quoted by Dr. Pusey;[1] the last two being pointed out by him as peculiarly significative of real change.

And it is worth observing, that Bellarmine also fixed upon the word μεταστοιχειοῦνται as used by Theophylact (which he translated as meaning *transelementation*), as the strongest word he could find in the Fathers to describe the change of the Eucharistic bread and wine; "and which," he remarks, "certainly "means nothing less than transubstantiation; for transelemen- "tation signifies a change of the whole thing even to its pri- "mary elements, that is, even to the very matter itself, which "by Aristotle is called the element."[2] To be consistent, therefore, he ought also to have held that *the water of baptism* is *transubstantiated* on consecration.

Now, as it respects the doctrine of Transubstantiation, I think it sufficient here to refer the reader to the abundant proof given by Dr. Pusey,[3] that none of these words necessarily imply a change of substance, the Fathers using these words in cases

[1] The Doctrine of the Real Presence as contained in the Fathers, pp. 166, 167.

[2] Quæ certe vox nihil minus significat, quam transubstantiatio: nam transelementatio significat mutationem totius rei usque ad prima elementa, id est, usque ad ipsam materiam, quæ ab Aristotele elementum vocatur. Bellarm. De Euch. lib. iii. c. 23. Op. ed. cit. iii. 636.

[3] Ib pp. 167—264.

where no such change can be imagined. They do not, therefore, show that the Fathers held the doctrine of Transubstantiation.

But then succeeds the question, What sort of change do these words denote, or what change did the Fathers intend to imply by the use of them? Dr. Pusey's answer to this question is, that the change consists in this, namely, that while "the elements remain," "under them are present the Body and Blood of Christ." (p. 314.) God "changes nature, by giving us, through "and under the form of visible creatures, the invisible substance "of the Sacrament, the Body and Blood of Christ. We believe "a change, but sacramental, not physical; a superadded gift, "not a destruction of the bodily element." (p. 300.) And therefore he contends that the terms "imply *sacramental* change only."

Archdeacon Denison takes the same view.

The statements of Archdeacon Wilberforce on the point go much further, and seem intended to be capable of including even the doctrine of Transubstantiation, though the position he held in our Church when he wrote them prevented him from *directly* maintaining that doctrine; for he tells us, that the terms μεταποιοῦνται, μεταῤῥυθμίζονται, μεταστοιχειοῦνται, "imply a change in the ingredients, or constituent parts of the consecrated elements," and that they, "especially the last," "are far more emphatic than *transfigurare* or *transformare*, which we find in Latin writers."[1]

Now, that these terms imply "*sacramental* change," I doubt not; but the question is, *what* a "*sacramental* change *is*;" and therefore this use of the word *sacramental* tends only to mislead and confuse. But, passing over this verbal objection, I must observe, that the superaddition of something to the elements is not a *change* of the elements. Dr. Pusey urges against the notion that these terms teach the doctrine of Transubstantiation, that, according to that doctrine, there is not any change or conversion of the substance of the Bread and Wine into the Body and Blood of Christ, because the supposition is, that the substance of the Bread and Wine *ceases to be*, and the Body and Blood come into their place. (pp. 184; 232, 233.) But this objection applies much more strongly to his own view; for superaddition is still less change. There *is* a sort of change in

[1] On the Euch. p. 277, or 3rd. ed. p. 237.

the elements according to the doctrine of Transubstantiation; but according to the doctrine of Dr. Pusey and Archdeacon Denison, there is none at all in the elements themselves, but only an *addition* to the elements of the Body and Blood of Christ. If, therefore, these words are to be taken in their most literal sense, as denoting a real change in the elements themselves, the doctrine of Dr. Pusey and Archdeacon Denison is beyond doubt altogether condemned by them.

Some change in the condition or relative character of the elements was certainly intended to be implied in these words; but, from the different sense in which these words are used, we cannot precisely tell *from the words themselves* what was the change intended to be implied by them.

I argue, therefore, that the sense in which the Fathers used the words *in pari materia*, namely, with respect to the water of baptism and the sacred ointment, is our best guide as to their meaning when they applied the words to the Eucharistic bread and wine; and at any rate, that we cannot affirm that they meant more in one case than in the other.

Now, in the passages quoted above, we find that the water of baptism is spoken of by Cyril of Alexandria and Ammonius as *transelemented* or *re-elemented* into a divine power; by Gregory of Nyssa as being changed; by Cyril of Jerusalem as receiving power; by Chrysostom as receiving the grace of the Spirit; by Epiphanius as endued with a certain *force;* by Tertullian as having imbibed the power of sanctifying; by the Council of Nice as full of the sanctification of the Spirit and of Divine fire; by the author of the work "De Sacramentis" as having the grace of Christ, and by Leo as filled with the Holy Spirit.

So also Gregory of Nyssa speaks of the mystic oil as being changed; and the author of the Catechetical Lectures, attributed to Cyril of Jerusalem, admonishes us, that we are not to look upon the consecrated chrism as "mere ointment;" "for as the "bread of the Eucharist, after the invocation of the Holy Spirit, "is no longer simple bread, but the body of Christ; so also "that holy ointment is no longer simple, nor, as one might say, "common ointment, after invocation, but *the charisma of Christ*, "and by the presence of the Holy Spirit brings his divinity "into operation."

Here then we see that, among other similar words, even that

one that has been specially pointed out as the strongest and most emphatic in denoting the change that passes upon the bread and wine, namely *transelement* (μεταστοιχειοῦνται), is also used to represent the change that passes upon the water of baptism, and that we are told that the consecrated chrism is not to be looked upon as mere ointment, but "the charisma of Christ;" &c.

Are there any, then, that believe, that the Fathers held, either that the water of baptism and the consecrated chrism were changed as to their intrinsic nature or substance, *i. e.*, transubstantiated; or, that Christ, or the blood of Christ, or the Holy Spirit, or in short anything, was so *united to* the water or the chrism as to form with them *one compound whole*, such that when the one was applied in any way to the body, the other also was received *by the body in the same way?* I know not of any. Certainly Archdeacon Wilberforce seems distinctly to admit, that the water of baptism undergoes *no change*. For he says,—"Though Christ is allowed to be present in Baptism by spiritual power, yet his presence is to be sought in the ordinance at large, and *not in the elements*." And he adds, what the passages just quoted, and more especially some of those cited under a former head,[1] show to be altogether incorrect;—"So that the symbol employed is never spoken of as gaining, *in itself*, any relation to the sacred object of which it is fitted to remind men."[2]

The question therefore remains, What *is* the change here spoken of as passing upon the bread and wine upon consecration. The terms used to describe that change are applied by the Fathers (as Dr. Pusey admits, and proves at some length) to changes of various kinds; sometimes to changes affecting the substance of the thing spoken of, at other times to changes in which it must be admitted by all that no change of substance can be alluded to; and often to changes *in which only the character, use, operation, or effect of the thing is changed.*

It may be well briefly to cite some of Dr. Pusey's statements on this point.

First, on the word *transmade* (μεταποιεῖσθαι), which the

[1] See pp. 381 et seq. above.

[2] Wilb. on the Euch. p. 104, or 3rd ed. p. 89.

Roman-Catholic Dublin Reviewer considers the strongest of all, Dr. Pusey remarks,—

"It has been shown long ago,[1] that S. Gregory of Nyssa used this same word 'transmade' of the glorious appearance of Moses' countenance, when he came from the Presence of God; the change of the soul to good, or again to that which is more Divine, through the discipleship of Christ; of the Christian character by the absence or the presence of love; that to listen to the prayer of the angry would imply a *change* of character in God. . . . . These are varied uses of the word, showing its idiomatic meaning in the living language, that it is simply an energetic word, used of any change, whether it be of *quality*, human or divine *character*, or of *appearance*, and that it does not in any way specially denote any *material* change."[2]

On the word *transelemented* (μεταστοιχειοῦσθαι), which is particularly noticed by Bellarmine, the Dublin Reviewer, and Archdeacon Wilberforce, as specially emphatic, and proving a change in the ingredients or constituent parts of the elements, Dr. Pusey observes, among other remarks,—

"The next word is μεταστοιχειοῦσθαι, which the Dublin Reviewer translates by '*transelementing*,' and which he supposes to express, by force of its very etymology, 'a physical change of the elements' into the Body and Blood of Christ. Whoever has been ever so little conversant with the study of language, knows *how utterly unsafe it is, to argue as to the actual meaning of a word in a living language from the idea originally contained in its root*. . . . The word, as applied to the Holy Eucharist, occurs (as far as I am aware) in S. Gregory of Nyssa alone of the Fathers, in the *one* passage already quoted. . . . . Albertinus (Art. Greg. Nyss. p. 488) states, that, 'besides this place, S. Gregory uses this word in nineteen other places only, and in all, without any exception, to designate CHANGE OF CONDITION OR VIRTUE, *not of substance*.' . . . From S. Cyril of Alexandria, Albertinus quotes thirty instances in which the word is used of changes in which there is no *material* alteration; of changing our flesh into life. . . . . the water of Baptism being changed into a Divine and ineffable power; Israel into a new people; our minds; &c. . . . . St. Cyril uses the word ἀναστοιχειοῦται or μεταστοιχειοῦται of the water of Baptism. . . . . The word ἀναστοιχειόω illustrates, in this respect, the use of μεταστοιχειόω, that in

[1] He here refers, in a note, to "Albertin. de Euchar. Art. Greg. Nyss. p. 487."
[2] PUSEY'S Doctr. of Real Pres. vindic. in Notes on Serm. &c. pp. 185, 186.

neither is there any reference to the 'elements' of which anything is composed. Ἀναστοιχειόω is to 're-form,' μεταστοιχειόω, to 'transform;' the one to restore to a previous *condition*, the other to change into another."[1]

On the word *re-order* or *re-model* (μεταῤῥυθμίζω), which St. Chrysostom (and *he alone*) *once* employs with reference to the Eucharist,[2] he remarks, that St. Chrysostom also uses it with reference to the lions among whom Daniel was thrown, and the fire of the furnace into which the three youths were cast at Babylon; writing thus,—"For the elements, forgetting their own nature, were *changed* (μετεβάλλοντο) into what was profitable for them; and the wild beasts were no longer beasts, nor the furnace, a furnace. For hope in God *remodels* all things (ἡ γὰρ εἰς τὸν Θεὸν ἐλπὶς πάντα μεταῤῥυθμίζει)."[3] And he adds other similar instances of its use in Chrysostom and others.[4]

He then proceeds to show the same with respect to the other terms used in this matter;[5] but, those just noticed being confessedly by far the strongest, it seems unnecessary here to go further into the matter.

Dr. Pusey, therefore, has himself shown us, that the use of these terms is no evidence in proof of the doctrine he has advanced.

Were it requisite, it would be easy to show, that the terms are used in the same way by the Classical writers (as they are commonly called); as for instance, μεταῤῥυθμίζω, by Æschylus for describing the change wrought upon the Bosphorus by Xerxes when he made it an instrument for conveying over his army.[6] But what has been already adduced seems amply sufficient for our present purpose.

The conclusion is irresistible, namely, that the use of these terms to describe what passes upon the bread and wine on consecration, does not prove, that the Fathers held the doctrine either of Transubstantiation or Consubstantiation. For Dr. Pusey's own proofs as to the way in which the terms are used,

[1] Id. ib. pp. 195—208.
[2] Chrys. Hom. de Prod. Jud. i. § 6. Op. ii. 384.
[3] Chrys. Exp. in Ps. x. init. Op. v. 113.
[4] pp. 210—219.
[5] pp. 219—264.
[6] Καὶ πόρον μετεῤῥύθμιζε. Æschyl. Persæ, ver. 744.

show that they no more support *his* doctrine of Consubstantiation than they do the Roman-Catholic doctrine of Transubstantiation. And I think the impartial reader will agree with me in thinking, that the use of these terms respecting the water of Baptism is a very good, and certainly our best, guide to enable us to judge what the Fathers meant when they applied the words to the Eucharistic bread and wine.

The nature of the change may briefly be described in the language of Isidore of Seville, who, speaking of the bread and wine, says,—

"But these, while they are visible, yet, being sanctified by the Holy Spirit, pass into *a sacrament of the Divine Body*." [1]

And it is curious to observe how Dr. Pusey, when noticing the way in which it is said that as "the bread is the body of Christ," so "the Chrism is Christ's gift of grace," evades the argument arising out of this statement against his own doctrine, and turns it only against the doctrine of Transubstantiation. For he says:—

"Yet it was not the chrism itself which was Christ's gift of grace. It was but the instrument and vehicle of it. *He calls the Chrism by the name of the grace which it conveys.* So then the parallel fits in best with the belief, that the elements remain, but are called the Body and Blood of Christ, because they CONTAIN THEM 'UNDER THE FORM OF BREAD AND WINE,' and the consecrated elements convey the spiritual Substance which they CONTAIN." [2]

But does Dr. Pusey hold, that the Chrism CONTAINS the gift of grace UNDER THE FORM OF OINTMENT? No; nor that the water of baptism is transelemented into a compound consisting partly of water and partly of something else. So that the "parallel" is as much against his own doctrine as it is against that of Transubstantiation.

The case, then, is just this. The Fathers spoke of a change in the water of Baptism by consecration similar to that which is attributed by them to the bread and wine in the Eucharist.

[1] Hæc autem, dum sunt visibilia, sanctificata tamen per Spiritum Sanctum, in sacramentum Divini Corporis transeunt. ISIDOR. HISPAL. De eccles. offic. lib. 1. c. 18. Op. ed. Arevalo, tom. vi. col. 383, 384.

[2] PUSEY, loc. cit. pp. 278, 279.

They therefore who profess to follow them, must either hold, that the water of Baptism undergoes such a change as they plead for in the bread and wine, or that the change spoken of in *both* cases is not an intrinsic change, but one of *operation* and *effect*, such as the fire of the fiery furnace underwent in the case of the Hebrew youths, which, while it had no effect upon *them*, burnt up those that bound them. They cannot rationally say, that the change is of one kind in Baptism and of another in the Eucharist.

That I may not seem to be taking new ground on this point, I will at once direct the reader to the remarks made respecting it by two writers of our Church, against whom the Authors under review cannot, I think, take exception,—Hooker and Bishop Cosin. Thus speaks Hooker:—

"Again, as evident it is how they [the Fathers] teach, that Christ is *personally* there present, yea, present whole, albeit a part of Christ be *corporally* absent from thence; that Christ assisting this heavenly banquet with his personal and true presence, doth by his own Divine power add to the natural substance thereof *supernatural efficacy, which addition* to the nature of those consecrated elements changeth them and maketh them that unto us which otherwise they could not be; that to us they are thereby made such instruments as mystically yet truly, invisibly yet really, work our communion or fellowship with the person of Jesus Christ as well in that he is man as God, our participation also in the fruit grace and efficacy of his body and blood, whereupon there ensueth a kind of transubstantiation in us, a true change both of soul and body, an alteration from death to life. *In a word, it appeareth not that of all the ancient Fathers of the Church any one did ever conceive or imagine other than only a mystical participation of Christ's both body and blood in the sacrament, neither are their speeches concerning the change of the elements themselves into the body and blood of Christ such, that a man can thereby in conscience assure himself it was their meaning to persuade the world either of a corporal consubstantiation of Christ with those sanctified and blessed elements before we receive them, or of the like transubstantiation of them into the body and blood of Christ.*"[1]

Nor let it be supposed, that his use of the word *corporal* indicates, that he is here referring to a doctrine different from that

[1] Hooker's Eccles. Pol. Bk. v. c. 67. § 11. Keble's ed. Oxf. 1836. ii. 456—458.

of the Authors under review, for by *corporal* he means *bodily in any form.* But he uses the term *corporal* because he holds that the substance of Christ's human body *cannot be present* except with the characteristic attributes of such a body. He expressly says,—"The substance of the body of Christ hath no presence, "neither can have, but only local. . . . If his majestical body "have now any such new property, by force whereof it may "every where really even *in substance* present itself, or may at "once be in many places, then hath the majesty of his estate "extinguished the verity of his nature."[1]

Next let us hear Bishop Cosin :—

"Because ordinary bread is changed by consecration into a bread which is no more *of common use*, but appointed by divine institution to be a *sacramental sign* whereby is represented the body of Christ, in whom dwelleth the fulness of the Godhead bodily; and being thereby dignified, having great excellences superadded, and so made what it was not before, it is therefore said by some of the Fathers to be changed, to be made another thing . . . . but it is a change of *state and condition*, which alters not the natural properties of the element. . . . The Fathers themselves use those words, transmutation, transformation, transelementation, upon other occasions, when they speak of things whose substance is neither lost nor changed; FOR THOSE WORDS BE OF SO LARGE A SIGNIFICATION, THAT THOUGH SOMETIMES A SUBSTANTIAL CHANGE IS TO BE UNDERSTOOD BY THEM, YET FOR THE MOST PART THEY SIGNIFY ONLY A MORAL CHANGE, A CHANGE OF QUALITIES, OF CONDITION, OF OFFICE, OF USE, AND THE LIKE. . . . But if, without admitting of a sacramental sense, the words be used too rigorously, nothing but this will follow, that the bread and wine are really and properly the very body and blood of Christ, which they themselves disown that hold transubstantiation [and also they that hold consubstantiation]. Therefore in this change it is not a newness of substance, *but of use and virtue*, that is produced; which yet the Fathers acknowledged, with us, to be wonderful, supernatural, and proper only to God's omnipotency: for that earthly and corruptible meat cannot become to us a spiritual and heavenly, the communion of the body and blood of Christ, without God's especial power and operation. And whereas it is far above philosophy and human reason, that *Christ from Heaven* (*where alone He is locally*) *should reach down to us the Divine virtue of His flesh, so that we are made one*

[1] Id. ib. v. c. 55. § 6. ib. 308, 309.

*body with Him;* therefore it is as necessary as it is reasonable that the Fathers should tell us, that we ought with singleness of heart to believe the Son of God, when he saith, 'This is my body;' and that we ought not to measure this high and holy mystery by our narrow conceptions, or by the course of nature." [1]

The Fathers "understood *no other change* than that which is "common to all sacraments, whereby the outward natural part is "said to be changed into the inward and divine, *only because it* "*represents it truly and efficaciously,* and makes all *worthy receivers* "partakers thereof; and because, by the virtue of the Holy "Spirit, and of Christ's holy institution, the elements obtain "*those divine excellencies and prerogatives,* which they cannot "have of their own nature. *And this is it which was taught* "*and believed for above a thousand years together by pious and* "*learned antiquity concerning this most holy mystery.*" [2]

(28.) *The Fathers, while they held that the body of Christ, as it respects its substance, is absent in heaven, also maintained, that the presence of that body to faith is a real presence;—a more real presence to our souls, according to Augustine, than if our bodies touched it;—and they maintained, that in the Eucharist there is a special presence of that body to the faithful communicant, through the operation of the Holy Spirit, and a reception of it such as produces or renews a spiritual union between our Lord's human nature and the believer; and that by the agency of that Spirit we are made partakers of the virtue that dwells in it, while its substance is nevertheless absent from us in heaven.*

The Authors under review, like all those who maintain their doctrine, are fond of reasoning, that, as we are said to eat and drink the body and blood of Christ in the Eucharist, they must be really present in the consecrated substances received into our mouths, that we may be able to do so.

But in this reasoning it is entirely forgotten *what sort of act* the eating and drinking spoken of is. If it was an eating and drinking with the bodily mouth, this reasoning would hold good. But, though such is the eating and drinking of the *sacra-*

[1] Cosin's Hist. of Transubstantiation, ch. vi. §§ 7 and 10. ed. 1840. pp. 143—145 and 152, 153. I quote from the English translation as of general reception.
[2] Id. ib. ch. vi. § 1. p. 136.

*mental* body and blood, the eating and drinking of the real body and blood of Christ is an act of a very different kind—an act of the soul through faith.

Such, as we have seen,[1] was the doctrine of the Fathers.

And the Fathers held, that the body of Christ, though, in substance, absent in heaven, (for I have shown [2] that this is their doctrine) is as much and as really present to our souls, through faith, for all the acts of faith, as if our bodies touched it. The Fathers constantly press the consideration that the body of Christ, though absent in heaven, is seen by faith, is touched by faith, is laid hold of by faith, and therefore is as really present to faith as if it was locally present.

Thus, Augustine says,—

"For we do not go to Christ by walking, but by believing; nor do we approach him by the motion of the body, but by the desire of the heart. Therefore the woman that touched the border of his garment *touched him more than the crowd that pressed upon him.* Therefore the Lord said, 'Who touched me?' . . . What means 'touched' but 'believed'? . . . Thus is he touched by those by whom he is worthily touched, when ascending to the Father, *remaining with the Father*, equal to the Father." [3]

Now if the body of Christ was substantially, though (if that were possible) in a spiritual form, on the communion table in or with or under the form of the elements, we certainly *could* approach him by the motion of the body. But the statement of Augustine is, that it is only by *an act of the soul* that we approach Christ, and that by that act we may even touch him, though he is in heaven *"remaining with the Father,"* and more truly touch him by such an act than if our bodies pressed against his body.

And so in another place he says,—

[1] See pp. 297—309 above. [2] See pp. 328—350 above.

[3] Non enim ad Christum ambulando currimus, sed credendo; nec motu corporis, sed voluntate cordis accedimus. Ideo illa mulier quæ fimbriam tetigit, magis tetigit quam turba quæ pressit. Ideo Dominus dixit, Quis me tetigit? . . . Quid est tetigit, nisi credidit? . . . Sic tangitur ab eis a quibus bene tangitur, adscendens ad Patrem, *manens cum Patre*, æqualis Patri. AUGUST. In Johan. Evang. tract. 26. § 1. Op. iii. Pt. 2. col. 358. See also a similar passage in his Serm. 244. (In dieb. Pasch. 15.) §§ 2, 3. Op. v. 708, 709.

"We cannot touch him with the hand now that he is sitting in heaven, but we *can touch him by faith*." [1]

And therefore he says elsewhere,—

"The *absence* of the Lord is *not absence*; exercise faith, and he is with thee whom thou dost not see." [2]

And this can apply only to the human nature of Christ, for in no sense is his Divine nature *absent* from us.

And to the question,—"How shall I lay hold of one who is "absent? How shall I put forth my hand into heaven, that I "may hold him who sits there,"—he replies,—"Put forth faith, and thou hast hold of him." [3]

He does not consider the absence of Christ's body in heaven to present any difficulty to our touching it and laying hold of it in a spiritual sense and by an act of the soul; or therefore to our eating it spiritually and by faith as the mouth of the soul. For if the body of Christ remaining in heaven can be "*touched*," it can be *eaten*, and therefore must be *present* to him who so touches and eats. But all this language applies only to the acts of faith.

Again, in a passage more fully quoted above [4] he says,—

"The Church had Christ for a few days according to the presence of the flesh; *now it has him by faith*."

And elsewhere, pointing out the various modes of his presence, he says,—

"According to the presence of his glory and divinity he is always with the Father; according to his bodily presence, he is now above the heavens at the right hand of the Father; but *according to the presence of* [or, *to*] *faith*, he is in all Christians." [5]

They therefore who quote Augustine must not talk of a *presence of faith* being no presence at all. For this, according to Augustine, is not only as real a presence in a spiritual sense as a local presence to the body in an earthly sense, but it is *the* presence by which Christ is now in us. Had he held the notions

[1] Ipsum jam in cœlo sedentem manu contrectare non possumus, sed fide contingere. Aug. In Epist. Johan. tract. i. § 3. Op. iii. Pt. 2. col. 603.

[2] Absentia Domini non est absentia; habeto fidem, et tecum est quem non vides. Id. Serm. 235. In dieb. Pasch. vi. Op. v. 690.

[3] See p. 300 above. [4] See p. 299 above. [5] See p. 299 above.

of the Authors under review, it is impossible that he should not, in this passage, have added that presence by which they suppose our Lord to be in the Eucharistic elements.

Thus also Ambrose, commenting on the passage relative to the woman that touched the border of Christ's garment, says,—

"Christ is touched by faith, Christ is seen by faith; he is not touched by the body, he is not comprehended by the eyes; for he does not see, who seeing sees not; nor does he hear, who understands not what he hears; nor does he touch, who does not touch with faith." [1]

And in a passage already quoted, [2] evidently attributing Stephen's sight of our Lord in heaven to an act of the mind, not of the bodily eyesight, he says,—

"Stephen did not seek thee on the earth, who beheld thee standing on the right hand of God; but Mary, because she sought thee on earth, could not touch thee. Stephen *touched* thee, because he sought thee in heaven; Stephen among the Jews *saw thee when absent;* Mary among the angels did not see thee when present."

To the same effect is the language already quoted under a former head from Jerome, where he says,—

"Let us ascend with our Lord to the great Supper-chamber prepared and cleansed, and let us receive from him *above* the cup of the New Testament; and there with him celebrating the Passover, let us be inebriated with the wine of sobriety from him." [3]

These words show that he regarded the presence we are to seek in the Eucharist, a presence to our spirits, realized by faith.

There is also a striking passage of Chrysostom to the same effect,—

"When you see the Lord sacrificed and lying [on the Table], and the priest standing by the sacrifice, and praying; and all [the communicants] red with that precious blood; do you think yourself to be still among men, and to stand upon the earth? and not rather to be translated direct to heaven? And casting out of your soul

[1] Fide tangitur Christus, fide Christus videtur: non corpore tangitur, non oculis comprehenditur; neque enim videt, qui videns non videt; neque audit, qui ea quæ audit non intelligit; neque tangit, qui non fideliter tangit. AMBROS. Expos. Evang. sec. Luc. lib. vi. § 57. Op. i. 1397.

[2] See p. 320 above.

[3] See p. 321 above.

all fleshly thoughts, you look round upon the things in heaven with a clear soul and a pure mind. Oh! wonderful! Oh! the loving-kindness of God! He who *sits above with the Father* is at that time held in the hands of all, and gives himself *to those who desire the gift*, that they may embrace and lay hold of him. BUT ALL DO THIS BY THE EYES OF FAITH." [1]

The concluding words show how the whole passage is to be interpreted. In fact, when he speaks of the communicants being "red with the blood of Christ," it must be admitted by all that he is speaking in highly figurative language. Our Lord himself *sits above with the Father*, but *sacramentally* he lies sacrificed upon the Communion Table, and is in the hands of all the communicants; and to the eye of faith he is present, seen and handled by faith as much as if his body itself was there.

And again, elsewhere, in a passage which has been already quoted in part,[2] he clearly intimates the same doctrine. Speaking of the importance of brotherly union, he says, that the Eucharist, which, in his usual style of language, he calls "the awful and tremendous sacrifice," leads us to this, "warning us "to approach it especially with concord, and fervent charity; "and thence having become eagles, thus to fly *to heaven itself*. "'For *where* the carcase is,' says our Lord, '*there* are also the "eagles;' *calling his body a carcase* on account of its death. "For if he had not fallen, we should not have risen. But *he* "*calls us eagles*, showing that he who approaches to this body "ought to have his mind aloft, and to have nothing common to "the earth, nor to be drawn downwards and creep on the earth, "but always without intermission to fly high, and to look "intently to the Sun of righteousness, and to have the eye of

[1] Ὅταν γὰρ ἴδῃς τὸν Κύριον τεθυμένον, καὶ κείμενον, καὶ τὸν ἱερέα ἐφεστῶτα τῷ θύματι, καὶ ἐπευχόμενον· καὶ πάντας ἐκείνῳ τῷ τιμίῳ φοινισσομένους αἵματι· ἆρα ἔτι μετὰ ἀνθρώπων εἶναι νομίζεις, καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἑστάναι; ἀλλ' οὐκ εὐθέως ἐπὶ τοὺς οὐρανοὺς μετανίστασαι; καὶ πᾶσαν σαρκικὴν διάνοιαν τῆς ψυχῆς ἐκβάλλων, γυμνῇ τῇ ψυχῇ καὶ τῷ νῷ καθαρῷ περιβλέπεις τὰ ἐν οὐρανοῖς. Ὦ τοῦ θαύματος· ὦ τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ φιλανθρωπίας· ὁ μετὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἄνω καθήμενος, κατὰ τὴν ὥραν ἐκείνην τοῖς ἁπάντων κατέχεται χερσὶ, καὶ δίδωσιν αὐτὸν τοῖς βουλομένοις περιπτύξασθαι καὶ περιλαβεῖν. Ποιοῦσι δὲ τοῦτο πάντες διὰ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν τῆς πίστεως. CHRYS. De sacerd. lib. iii. Op. i. 382.

[2] See p. 319 above.

"the understanding sharp. For this is a table of eagles, not "of jays."[1]

These words most distinctly represent that body of our Lord of which we are to partake, as *in heaven*, and that we are to rise there *in spirit*, to be made partakers of it.

There is also a remarkable passage of Gregory of Nazianzum, bearing strongly, though indirectly, on the point we are now considering. In the prospect of persecution, he says,—

"Will they drive me from the altars? But I know of another altar, of which the things now seen are *types;* upon which no axe or hand has come up, neither has any iron tool or any instrument of workmen and carvers been heard, but it is altogether *the work of the mind*, and *the ascent to it is by contemplation.* Before this will I present myself, at this will I offer acceptable offerings, sacrifice and oblation and holocausts, *as much better than the things now presented as truth is better than a shadow.*"[2]

Now if he had held that the very body of Christ was, in substance, upon the altars of the churches, it is utterly impossible that he could have used this language. He speaks of what is present there as types and shadows, and he rejoices that *by the act of the mind* he can rise to *the reality*.

Nor can we forget the emphatic language already quoted from Vigilius:—

"To believe on the Son of God, this is to see him, this is to hear him, this is to adore him, this is *to taste him*, this is to handle him."[3]

There can be no question that the writer of this believed that there was a *real presence* of the body of Christ to faith.

[1] Εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ ἡμᾶς ἡ θυσία ἐκείνη ἐνάγει ἡ φοβερὰ καὶ φρικώδης, κελεύουσα ἡμῖν μεθ' ὁμονοίας αὐτῇ μάλιστα προσιέναι καὶ θερμῆς ἀγάπης, καὶ ἀετοὺς γενομένους ἐντεῦθεν, οὕτω πρὸς αὐτὸν ἵπτασθαι τὸν οὐρανόν. Ὅπου γὰρ τὸ πτῶμά, φησιν, ἐκεῖ καὶ οἱ ἀετοὶ, πτῶμα καλῶν τὸ σῶμα διὰ τὸν θάνατον. Εἰ μὴ γὰρ ἐκεῖνος ἔπεσεν, ἡμεῖς οὐκ ἀνέστημεν. Ἀετοὺς δὲ καλεῖ, κ. τ. λ. (as in p. 319 above.)

[2] Θυσιαστηρίων εἴρξουσιν; ἀλλ' οἶδα καὶ ἄλλο θυσιαστήριον, οὗ τύποι τὰ νῦν δρώμενα· ἐφ' ὃ λαξευτήριον οὐκ ἀναβέβηκεν, οὐδὲ χειρ, οὐδὲ ἠκούσθη σίδηρος, ἤ τι τῶν τεχνιτῶν καὶ ποικίλων, ἀλλ' ὅλον τοῦ νοῦ τὸ ἔργον, καὶ διὰ θεωρίας ἡ ἀνάβασις. τούτῳ παραστήσομαι, τούτῳ θύσω δεκτὰ, θυσίαν, καὶ προσφορὰν, καὶ ὁλοκαυτώματα, κρείττονα τῶν νῦν προσαγομένων, ὅσῳ κρεῖττον σκιᾶς ἀλήθεια. Gregor. Naz. Orat. 26. (al. 28.) § 16. Op. i. 483.

[3] See p. 349 above.

The Fathers clearly had no notion, that there could not be a *real presence* of the body of Christ to us, such as is suitable to the nature of the Eucharistic rite, unless there was a presence of *the substance* of that body, in some form or other, to our *bodily mouths*. Their statements evidence the maintenance of a doctrine of a totally different kind.

And anyone who will examine the language of the Fathers with any degree of care will find, that they delighted in speaking of the acts of the soul in phraseology derived from the acts of the body; following in this, as they themselves say, the custom of Holy Scripture; and they do not hesitate to ascribe all the reality which accompanies the local presence of a thing to the body, to that presence which the soul is enabled to realize.

Thus Chrysostom speaks of the superior power of the eyes of the mind to see things absent, to that of the bodily eyes to see things locally present.

Thus he says,—

"For these bodily eyes cannot so well see the things that are visible as the eyes of the Spirit the things that are invisible, nay, the things that do not exist." [1]

And again,—

"For the body being terrestrial and heavy, by its nature remains below; but the soul is freed from this necessity, and easily ascends to the most lofty and remote regions; so that if it should wish to go to the very ends of the world, and to ascend into heaven,[2] there is nothing to hinder it: such light wings of thought has God given to it. And He has not only given to it light wings, but has also granted to it eyes that see much better than those of the body.[3] .... The eyes of the soul, even though they should find ramparts and walls and great mountains and the very heavenly bodies in their way, easily pass through all." [4]

And so Hilary says that—

"So far do the eyes of the mind excel the eyes of the body, that

[1] Οὐδὲ γὰρ οὕτως οἱ σωματικοὶ οὗτοι ὀφθαλμοὶ τὰ δρώμενα βλέπειν δύνανται, ὡς οἱ τοῦ πνεύματος ὀφθαλμοὶ τὰ μὴ δρώμενα, μηδὲ τὰ ὑφεστῶτα. Chrys. In Genes. (c. i.) hom. x. § 4. Op. iv. 76.

[2] Εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀναβῆναι.

[3] Ὀφθαλμος ἐχαρίσατο πολλῷ τοῦ σώματος ὀξύτερον βλέποντας.

[4] Chrys. In illud (Es. vi. 1.) *Vidi Dominum*, &c. homil. ii. § 1. Op. vi. 107.

we forget present things, and a certain *enjoyment* of absent things, anticipated as it were by the soul, wholly possesses us." [1]

This is spoken even of the power of the soul in ordinary matters, apart from any consideration of the power of faith or the aid of the Holy Spirit.

And still more pertinently Augustine remarks, that "faith has its eyes." [2]

Thus also Vigilius, in the passage from which I have just given a brief extract, speaks of the acts of the soul in spiritual things conformably with the acts of the body through another of the bodily senses. Commenting on the words of St. John, "That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, which our hands have handled of the Word of life," &c. he says,—

"Let us attend to the spiritual words of the Apostle with spiritual views, words by which he testifies that he has seen and handled the Word of God, not with bodily eyes and hands, but *with the members of the inner man.* For with such nostrils as those with which his smell is inhaled, and with such mouth as that with which his sweetness is tasted, with such eyes and ears and hands is he touched. Moreover the Church says to him, 'Thy name is ointment poured forth, and we will run after thee for the smell of thine ointments.' And Paul says, 'We are a sweet odour of Christ.' And David, 'Taste and see how sweet the Lord is.' Therefore to believe on the Son of God, this is to see, this is to hear, this is to adore, this is to taste, this is to touch him. But by 'touch' the strength of belief is intimated, for to this sense more credit is due than to the other senses. For both the eyes are often deceived by a phantom, and the ears by a falsehood. Therefore in this sense the Apostle had so touched him, that is, had so firmly believed on him, that he could never at any time doubt respecting him. And therefore he says, 'What we have seen with our eyes, and our hands have handled.' . . . . *By believing, not by seeing,* the Apostle says, that he *had seen* that which was from the beginning; he saw him by the glass of faith darkly, being about to see him hereafter more clearly

[1] Adeo mentis oculi oculis corporis præstant, ut ineunte in nos oblivione præsentium, totos nos obtineat quidam quasi animo præsumtus usus absentium. HILAR. PICTAV. Tract. in Psalm. cxx. § 2. Op. 378.

[2] Habet namque fides oculos suos. AUGUST. Ep. ad Consent. epist. cxx. c. 2. or, § 8. Op. ii. 265.

when the veil has been removed. . . . The Apostle does not say, 'And our hands have handled the Word of life,' but he says, 'have handled of the Word of life.' They have not therefore handled him, but of him; which is seen very clearly to relate not to *the handling of a visible touch*, but to *the handling of the mind*." [1]

On this statement, as an exposition of the text of Scripture on which it is written, I make no remark. But of the way in which the Fathers spoke on these subjects, it affords us a very striking illustration.

And so, to come still nearer to the point in question, we find the soul spoken of as *eating and masticating the food of the word of God;* where it would be just as reasonable to assert, that the Fathers meant that the Book of the Holy Scriptures must be swallowed by the bodily mouth in order that the soul might derive benefit from it, as it is to say that they meant that the body of our Lord must be swallowed by the bodily mouth for the purpose of enabling the soul to feed upon it. Thus Origen speaks of "those who are able to chew and masticate with their teeth to the greatest degree of fineness the strong and solid meat of the word of God." [2]

The homily from which this passage is taken was translated by Rufinus, and forms nearly the whole of the first book of the

[1] Spiritalia Apostoli verba spiritaliter advertamus, quibus se non oculis et manibus corporeis, sed interioris hominis membris vidisse et palpasse Verbum Dei testatur. Quia quibus naribus odor ejus hauritur, et quo ore suavitas ejus gustatur, ipsis oculis et auribus et manibus contrectatur. Denique dicit ad eum Ecclesia, Unguentum effusum nomen tuum, et post te in odorem unguentorum tuorum curremus. Et Paulus inquit, Christi bonus odor sumus. Et David, Gustate et videte quoniam suavis est Dominus. Credere ergo in Filium Dei, hoc est videre, hoc est audire, hoc est adorare, hoc est gustare, hoc est contrectare eum. In tactu autem firmitas credulitatis insinuatur, cui sensui præ cæteris sensibus major fides habeatur. Nam et oculi phantasmate, et aures mendacio sæpe falluntur. Hoc ergo sensu Apostolus ita eum tetigerat, id est, ita in eum fundatissime crediderat, ut nunquam de eo posset aliquando dubitare. Et ideo ait, Quod oculis nostris vidimus, et manus nostræ palpaverunt. . . . Credendo ergo, non videndo, ait Apostolus, vidisse se id, quod ab initio est: vidit per fidei speculum in ænigmate, visurus manifestius retecto velamine. . . . Non enim ait Apostolus, Et manus nostræ tractaverunt Verbum vitæ, sed, tractaverunt, inquit, de Verbo vitæ. Non ergo ipsum, sed de ipso tractaverunt, quod non ad contrectationem visibilis tactus, sed ad contrectatum mentis invenitur manifestissime pertinere. VIGIL. TAPS. Contra Eutych. lib. iv. c. 7. ed. cit. fol. 103.

[2] Qui fortem et solidum cibum verbi Dei mandere et comminuere ad summam subtilitatem dentibus possunt. ORIGEN. Comment. in Genes. hom. xvii. § 9. Op. 110.

work, "De Benedictionibus Patriarcharum," attributed to Rufinus, but which there can be little doubt belongs to Origen.

In the first book of that work we again meet with a similar expression, in the words, "Those who eat the pure and immaculate and solid meats of the word of God."[1]

And so Gregory Nyssen says,—

"For as, having masticated with our teeth bodily food, we prepare it so that it may be suitable for the bowels, just in the same way is there a certain power in the soul to masticate doctrines, by which the lesson becomes useful to him who receives it."[2]

Still further, the Fathers, as we have seen, *applied* this language to *the particular case* of the acts of the soul with reference to Christ as the living bread.

Thus we have heard Origen saying, that as there is "a meat and drink of this material man," "suitable to its nature," so there is "an appropriate meat of that spiritual man, which is called the inner man, as *that living bread which descended from heaven;*"[3] and Basil, that "there is a certain spiritual mouth of the inner man, by which he is nourished receiving the Word of life, which is *the bread that came down from heaven;*"[4] and again, after observing that "the faculties of the soul are called by the same names as the external members of the body," he says that we enjoy Christ "the true bread" "through a mental taste;"[5] and Gregory Nyssen, that "there is a certain correspondency between the movements and operations of the soul, and the bodily organs of sense and feeling," as for instance, "a touch of the soul which touches the Word, acting through *a certain incorporeal and intellectual contact.*"[6]

For, holding the views they did as to the power and acts of the soul in ordinary matters of faith, much more did they recognise the reality of that which takes place in the soul upon the right reception of the Eucharistic elements, where they believed that the objects of faith—the body and blood of

[1] Qui puros et immaculatos et solidos edant verbi Dei cibos. RUFIN. AQUIL. De bened. Patriarch. lib. i. § 6. Op. ed. Vallars. 18.

[2] "Ὥσπερ γὰρ δὴ τὴν σωματικὴν τροφὴν τοῖς ὀδοῦσι καταλεάναντες, κατάλληλον αὐτὴν τοῖς σπλάγχνοις γενέσθαι παρασκευάζομεν· κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον ἐστί τις λεπτοποιητικὴ τῶν διδαγμάτων δύναμις ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ, δι' ἧς ὀφέλιμον γίνεται τῷ δεχομένῳ τὸ μάθημα. GREGOR. NYSS. In Cantic. hom. 7. Op. i. 581.

[3] See pp. 333, 334, and 345 above.

[4] See p. 335 above.

[5] See p. 348 above.

[6] See p. 346 above.

Christ—are so made present to the soul by the effectual operation of the Holy Spirit, and so received by faith, as to produce or renew the closest spiritual union and communion between Christ's human nature and the believer; and that through that communion, by means of the same mighty power, the grace and virtue of Christ's risen body are communicated to us. The presence is not only a presence to faith, but it is a presence of union and communion with the soul as real as the presence of the bread and wine to the body; effected through the agency of the Holy Spirit.

For, as the passages quoted under the last head show, they attributed the instrumentality of the bread and wine in making present to our souls the very body and blood of Christ, so as to bring us into spiritual communion with his Body, to the operation of the Holy Spirit. Adopting, for the obvious purpose of raising the veneration of the people for the sacred Eucharistic rite, a strong sacramental phraseology, they even spoke of the elements themselves as being changed by that operation. But, as it has been already observed, using the same language respecting the water of baptism, they have themselves supplied us with a clear indication of their meaning. For no one holds that they meant, that the water of baptism was in itself changed, but only that instrumentally it worked differently from water not attended with the same Divine blessing.

To the passages adduced under the last head, I need not here add; because it will not, I believe, be questioned by any one, that what is done in the Eucharist, be it what it may, is done by the operation of the Holy Spirit.

And in this admitted fact we obtain another argument against the notion of the Romanists and the Authors under review, that the real body and blood of Christ are, in substance, in, or joined to, or under the form of, the elements. For this *sort of presence* of the real body and blood of Christ is not attributable to the operation of the Holy Spirit. The action of the Holy Spirit in this matter is sometimes compared to the action of that blessed Spirit in the womb of the Virgin in the formation of the flesh of Christ. But the two cases are totally different. The body was then to be formed, and the creative power of the Godhead is exercised through the operation of the Holy Spirit. But the substantial presence of our

Lord's body, when formed, where he wills it to be present, is not attributable to the operation of the Holy Spirit. When our blessed Lord appeared to Stephen or St. Paul, I suppose no one would think of attributing that presence to the operation of the Holy Spirit. And if our Lord pleased to appear now in a visible form on earth, such a presence would not be attributable to the operation of the Holy Spirit any more than his appearance to the disciples in the upper room at Jerusalem, where they were assembled shortly after his resurrection, or his appearance to the two disciples on their way to Emmaus was so attributable. The very fact of the presence being attributed to the operation of the Holy Spirit demonstrates of itself the supposition of a different *sort of presence* from that maintained by the Romanists and the Authors under review.

And the Fathers, we must observe, constantly say, that our Lord is present with his disciples now *only* through the operation of the Holy Spirit.

I will show this by some extracts from their writings.

Thus, then, Cyril of Alexandria, in a passage already quoted,[1] says,—

"His Spirit dwelling in the saints supplies the place of the presence and the power of Christ."

And so elsewhere, that,—

"It seemed intolerable to the disciples to be separated from Christ, though he was to be always with them *by the power and energy of the Spirit.*"[2]

And in another place, already quoted,[3] he intimates that as his foretold *absence* from us was to be "*so far as concerns the flesh and his bodily presence,*" so his promised *presence* at the same time was to be "*by the energy and power and grace of the Spirit.*"

Now, these passages, of themselves, entirely negative the notion of a presence of the substance of Christ's body and blood, by whatever name it is called, material or immaterial, and maintain a presence of a very different kind.

[1] See p. 304 above.

[2] Οὐ φορητὸν εἶναι διεφαίνετο τὸ χωρίζεσθαι Χριστοῦ, καίτοι συνόντος αὐτοῖς διὰ παντὸς τῇ τοῦ Πνεύματος δυνάμει τε καὶ συνεργείᾳ. Id. ib. lib. ix. (in c. xiii. v. 37.) Op. iv. 755.

[3] See p. 303 above.

Again, on the words, "At that day ye shall know, that I am in the Father, and ye in me and I in you," he says,—

"Ye in me and I in you, so far as I have appeared as man, but I have rendered you partakers of the Divine nature, having made my Spirit to dwell in you. For *Christ is in us by the Spirit*, changing that which was by nature corruptible into incorruption, and transforming that which was mortal into that which is immortal." [1]

And further, the Fathers tell us that it is by the operation of the Holy Spirit that our communion with the body and blood of Christ is made effectual for rendering us partakers of the life-giving virtue that dwells in the exalted Saviour. It is by His agency that the vital communications are made from Christ the Head to the members of his mystical body.

Thus Cyril of Alexandria, on our Lord's words, "I am the true vine," &c. (Joh. xv. 1, &c.) says that,—

"He speaks of those as branches who are united to him, and in a manner engrafted and inserted into him, *and have been made partakers of his own nature, through a participation of the Holy Spirit.* For that which unites us to our Saviour Christ is his Holy Spirit." [2]

"For just as the root of the vine administers and distributes to the branches the enjoyment of that natural quality that belongs to it, so the only-begotten Word of God brings the saints into relationship as it were with his own nature and that of God the Father, giving them the Spirit, that is, to those who are joined to him by faith and all holiness." [3]

And Cyril expressly contends, as I shall show in the fourth Section of this Chapter, that our Lord is referring in this parable to our union with *his human nature*.

[1] Ὑμεῖς δὲ ἐν ἐμοὶ, κἀγὼ ἐν ὑμῖν, καθὸ πέφηνα μὲν ἄνθρωπος ἐγὼ, κοινωνοὺς δὲ θείας φύσεως ἀπέδειξα, τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἐμὸν ἐνοικίσας ὑμῖν. Ἐν ἡμῖν γάρ ἐστιν ὁ Χριστὸς διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος, μετατρέπων εἰς ἀφθαρσίαν τὸ φθείρεσθαι πεφυκὸς, καὶ μετατιθεὶς ἐκ τοῦ καταθνήσκειν πρὸς τὸ μὴ οὕτως ἔχον. Cyrill. Alex. In Joh. lib. ix. fin. Op. iv. 824.

[2] Κλήμασι [? κλήματα] γε μὴν τοὺς ἐνωθέντας αὐτῷ καὶ ἐνηρμοσμένους τρόπον τινὰ καὶ ἐμπεπηγότας, γεγονότας τε ἤδη τῆς ἑαυτοῦ φύσεως κοινωνοὺς, διὰ τοῦ μεταλαχεῖν ἁγίου πνεύματος· τὸ γὰρ συνενῶσαν ἡμᾶς τῷ σωτῆρι Χριστῷ τὸ ἅγιοι πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ ἐστίν. Cyrill. Alex. In Johann. lib. x. (in c. xv. v. 1.) Op. iv. 857.

[3] Ὅνπερ γὰρ τρόπον τῆς ἀμπέλου τὸ πρέμνον τῆς ἰδίας καὶ ἐνούσης αὐτῷ ποιότητος φυσικῆς διακονεῖ τε καὶ διανέμει τοῖς κλήμασι τὴν ἀπόλαυσιν, οὕτως ὁ μονογενὴς τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγος, τῆς τε τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς, καὶ τῆς ἑαυτοῦ φύσεως τὴν οἰονεὶ συγγένειαν τοῖς ἁγίοις ἐντίθησι, τὸ πνεῦμα διδοὺς, ἅτε δὴ καὶ συνενωθεῖσιν αὐτῷ διὰ τε τῆς πίστεως καὶ τῆς εἰσάπαν ὁσιότητος. Id. ib. p. 858.

And again,—

"Christ is in us through his own flesh vivifying us *by the Spirit*, and also through our participation of his holiness, which again is manifestly that holiness that is through the Holy Spirit." [1]

That lifegiving efficacy that has been given to the flesh of Christ as pervaded by the Spirit is communicated to us by the Spirit. The vivifying influence is derived from the flesh of Christ, and therefore is communicated to none but those who have been brought into union and communion with his body and blood, and have thus in the highest sense *received them;* but it is communicated through the agency of the Holy Spirit.

And so elsewhere he interprets the Apostle's words as to "Christ being formed in you," as referring to "our being re-formed towards God by the Holy Spirit impressing upon us his own peculiar characteristics, and transforming our understanding as it were to his own quality." [2]

And again,—

"For whole Christ dwells in each of us by our participation of the Holy Spirit, and is not divided, as Paul says." [3]

Again he tells us, in a passage already quoted,[4] that Christ is made life to us by being "introduced into us by faith, and he dwells in us by the Holy Spirit."

And lastly, speaking in his Comment on John vi. of the manna as shadowing forth that bread that gives life to the whole world, he says that our Lord—

"Blames the Jew for confining his view to the figure, and refusing to search into the excellence of the reality. For that was not manna properly, but the very only-begotten Word of God, that

[1] Ἐν ἡμῖν ἐστι, διά τε τῆς ἰδίας σαρκὸς ζωοποιούσης ἡμᾶς ἐν Πνεύματι, καὶ διὰ τοῦ μεταλαχεῖν τῆς ἁγιότητος αὐτοῦ, δῆλον δὲ ὅτι πάλιν τῆς διὰ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος. Id. Adv. Nestor. lib. v. Op. vi. 123.

[2] Τὴν δι' αὐτοῦ πρὸς Θεὸν ἀναμόρφωσιν, τοὺς οἰκείους ἡμῖν χαρακτῆρας ἐνθλίβοντος, καὶ εἰς τὴν ἰδίαν ὥσπερ ποιότητα τὴν διάνοιαν μεταπλάττοντος. Id. In Johann. lib. ii. (in c. iii. v. 6.) Op. iv. 148.

[3] Τέλειος γὰρ ἐν ἑκάστῳ Χριστὸς διὰ μετοχῆς τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος ἐνοικίζεται, καὶ οὐ μεμέρισται, καθάπερ ὁ Παῦλός φησι. Id. Glaph. in Exod. lib. ii. Op. i. p. 269.

[4] See p. 375 above.

proceeded from the substance of the Father,[1] who, since he is life by nature, gives life to all things. . . . For what the bread is to us which comes from the earth, preventing the infirm nature of our flesh from perishing, such also is he, *by the powerful operation of the Spirit* giving life to our spirit, and not only that, but preserving our body itself for incorruption." [2]

His presence with us as the heavenly bread, represented by the manna, and the communication to us of its lifegiving influence, are here expressly ascribed to the operation of the Holy Spirit.

Not only, therefore, according to Cyril, is our Lord's presence with us as God through the operation of the Holy Spirit, but it is by that Spirit *only* that he is now present with us. Our union and communion with his *human* nature is effected through the agency of that Spirit.

And this is only in accordance with what our Lord often said when on earth, as to the Holy Spirit supplying his place on earth after his ascension.

And it exactly agrees with that remarkable emblematical representation given of him to St. John, in which he appeared as "a Lamb as it had been slain, having seven horns and seven eyes, which are the seven spirits of God sent forth into all the earth." (Rev. v. 6.) By that agency, therefore, his human nature may be brought into actual union and communion with all his saints, and thus be really present to them in a spiritual manner.

And this, perhaps, is what Origen means when he tells us, in passages already quoted,[3] that our Lord is not present in the assemblies of the faithful as man, but "the Divine power which was in Jesus."

[1] The reader will observe these words, as showing how such expressions were used by the Fathers; for all agree that the manna was *only a figure.*

[2] Καταιτιᾶται τοίνυν τοῖς ἐν τύπῳ γεγενημένοις προσπεπηγότα τὸν Ιουδαῖον, καὶ τὸ ἐκ τῆς ἀληθείας κάλλος ἀναζητεῖν παραιτούμενον. Ἦν γὰρ οὐκ ἐκεῖνο τὸ μάννα κυρίως, ἀλλ' αὐτὸς ὁ μονογενὴς τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγος, ὁ ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας ἐρχόμενος τοῦ Πατρὸς, ἐπείπερ ἐστὶ κατὰ φύσιν ζωὴ, τὰ πάντα ζωογονῶν. . . . . Ὅπερ γὰρ ἄρτος ἡμῖν ὁ ἐκ γῆς εὑρίσκεται, τὴν ἀσθενῆ τῆς σαρκὸς φύσιν οὐκ ἐῶν καταφθείρεσθαι, τοῦτο καὶ αὐτὸς, διὰ τῆς τοῦ Πνεύματος ἐνεργείας τὸ πνεῦμα ζωοποιῶν, καὶ οὐ μέχρι τούτων, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ σῶμα συνέχων εἰς ἀφθαρσίαν. CYRILL. ALEX. Comment. in Johann. lib. iii. Op. iv. 312.

[3] See p. 297 above.

If the body of Christ were present substantially, though invisibly and in an immaterial form, in the assemblies of the faithful, this could not be said.

And Basil says,—

"But we are quickened by the Spirit, as Paul says, 'He that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you.' Therefore you are quickened by God through Christ by the Spirit. And on this account, since *every operation of the Son is manifested through the Spirit*, the Spirit is called Lord..... It is also said, 'Ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be the Spirit of God is in you. But if any one have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his.' *Then he adds, 'But if Christ be in you,' instead of saying, what naturally followed, 'But if the Spirit is in you.'*"[1]

He considered that the language of St. Paul showed, that to say, *Christ is in us*, is equivalent to saying that *the Spirit is in us*; "every operation of the Son," as he says, being "manifested through the Spirit."

To the same effect speaks Augustine.

Thus, in a passage already quoted, he says that "in the eating "of his flesh and the drinking of his blood the Lord commended "to us that we should dwell in him and he in us. But we "dwell in him, when we are his members; and he dwells in us, "when we are his temple..... *The Spirit makes us living "members.*"[2]

But still more clearly in the following remarkable passage. Having stated what our Lord meant when speaking of our eating his flesh and drinking his blood, he adds,—

"Let all this therefore, beloved, avail with us to produce this effect, that we do not eat the flesh and blood of Christ sacramentally only, which many wicked persons also do, but that we eat and drink *so as to become partakers of the Spirit*, that we may

[1] Ζωοποιούμεθα δὲ διὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος, ὥς φησιν κ. τ. λ..... Ζωογονῇ τοίνυν ὑπὸ Θεοῦ διὰ Χριστοῦ ἐν Πνεύματι. Καὶ διὰ τοῦτο, ἐπεὶ πᾶσα ἡ ἐνέργεια τοῦ Υἱοῦ διὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος φανεροῦται, Κύριος ὀνομάζεται τὸ Πνεῦμα..... Εἴρηται δὲ καὶ τὸ, Ὑμεῖς, κ. τ. λ..... Εἶτα ἐπάγει, Εἰ δὲ Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν, ἀντὶ τοῦ λέγειν, ὅπερ ἀκόλουθον ἦν, Εἰ δὲ τὸ Πνεῦμα ἐν ὑμῖν. BASIL. CÆS. Homil. de Spir. S. Op. ii. 584.

[2] See p. 338 above.

abide in the Lord's body as members, *that we may grow by his Spirit.*" [1]

Hence it was, no doubt, that in many of the old Liturgies a prayer is introduced that the Holy Spirit would descend upon the Bread and Wine, and make them the Body and Blood of Christ.

How far this language supports the doctrine of the Authors under review, I shall consider hereafter; but I allude to it now as showing that in whatever way they who used these Liturgies considered us to be made partakers now of the body and blood of Christ, it was held to be through the agency of the Holy Spirit. Hence Augustine, after observing, in a passage quoted above,[2] that "we call by the name of the body and blood "of Christ that only which, being taken from the fruits of the "earth, and consecrated by the sacramental prayer, we rightly "receive to our spiritual health, in memory of the Lord's pas-"sion for us," adds,—

"Which, when it is brought by the hands of men to that visible form, is not sanctified *so as to be so great a sacrament* without the invisible operation of the Spirit of God." [3]

And so Chrysostom, as quoted under the last head, says, that "the mystical Body and Blood could not be without the grace of the Spirit." [4]

And to the same effect speaks Gelasius.[5]

Now, what *sort of presence* is that which is spoken of in the above passages, and is produced by the operation of the Holy Spirit? Clearly not that mode of presence which is maintained by the Romanists and the Authors under review, namely, the presence of the actual substance of our Lord's body and

[1] Hoc ergo totum ad hoc nobis valeat, dilectissimi, ut carnem Christi et sanguinem Christi non edamus tantum in sacramento, quod et multi mali; sed usque ad Spiritus participationem manducemus et bibamus, ut in Domini corpore tanquam membra maneamus, ut ejus Spiritu vegetemur. AUGUST. In Johann. Evang. tract. xxvii. § 11. Op. iii. Pt. 2. col. 366.

[2] See p. 238 above.

[3] Quod cum per manus hominum ad illam visibilem speciem perducatur, non sanctificatur ut sit tam magnum sacramentum, nisi operante invisibiliter Spiritu Dei. AUGUST. De Trin. lib. iii. c. 4. Op. viii. 565.

[4] See p. 403 above.

[5] In divinam transeunt, Sancto Spiritu perficiente, substantiam, permanent tamen in suæ proprietate naturæ. GELAS. De duab. nat. in Christo. § 25. ed. cit. fol. 84.

blood, in a spiritual form, to our bodily mouths, but that presence to our spirits by which, through the operation of the Holy Spirit, our souls are not only enabled to behold and touch and feed upon the body and blood of Christ spiritually, but are also spiritually united to that body, so that its lifegiving efficacy and virtue are communicated to us—to our souls, and through them to our bodies—and we become spiritually one with our Blessed Lord, bone of his bone and flesh of his flesh, as by nature we were of the bone and flesh of Adam, and thus interested in the blessings he purchased by his death. The reality of the presence is such that we are united to him as the graft is united to the stock into which it is inserted, and are nourished and strengthened by the vital communications of grace that come to us from him. What more real presence can we desire than this? What more real presence, indeed, *can there be* for spiritual purposes than this? A presence to the mouth and stomach is nothing for such purposes.

Let those who insist so strongly upon the phrase, *real presence*, as necessarily betokening some such doctrine as transubstantiation or consubstantiation, ask themselves the question, What *is* a real presence *to the soul?* Is it any real presence of a thing *to the soul*, that it is brought into the mouth and stomach?

But the difficulty with many is, when words are used which are ordinarily applied to acts of the body, to understand them with reference to acts of the soul. And the consequence is, that, when eating and drinking are spoken of, they cannot divest their minds of notions connected with the acts of the bodily mouth, and therefore the true nature of the Eucharistic act is altogether misconceived.

The body of Christ is as truly present to the soul, and given to and received by the soul, when the soul is enabled to feed upon it by faith, and is spiritually united to it, and made partaker of its lifegiving efficacy by the Holy Spirit, as meat is truly present to the body, and given to and received by it, when the body receives it into the mouth and stomach, and there derives from it, by a natural process, the virtue which it contains. To spiritual union and communion, and therefore real presence to our spirits, local separation, if it so please God, need

cause no bar. The agency of the Holy Spirit can render it complete, whatever the distance may be.

But if men refuse to receive such phraseology in any other sense than that which is applicable to the acts of the body, they must be contented to remain ignorant of the true nature of the doctrines respecting which it is used.

Before I quit this point, it may be well to observe, that the doctrine of the Fathers, as here manifested, enables us fully to meet an objection sometimes brought against the language occasionally used by Protestant writers as to what is received in the Eucharist.

It is sometimes said by Protestant writers, that what is received in the Eucharist is the lifegiving virtue and efficacy of the flesh of Christ. To this it is objected, that such language is inconsistent with the doctrine that the Body of Christ is the thing received and eaten in the Eucharist.

But, in the first place, such language is clearly used by Augustine; for Archdeacon Wilberforce himself admits, that Augustine has not kept distinct the *res* and the *virtus* Sacramenti, but used the terms almost as if they were interchangeable, and *complains of him* for so doing. And this fact, as I have already pointed out,[1] shows that he did not hold the Archdeacon's views.

And when we come to see the doctrine of the Eucharist, as delivered in the passages above quoted from the Fathers, we see at once the reason why the two things were *not* separated by Augustine, *in the way* in which they are separated by the Romanists and the Authors under review. For, the same operation of the Holy Spirit that gives the presence of Christ's body to the soul, and spiritual communion with him, communicates also at the same time the lifegiving efficacy of that body to those who are thus brought into communion with it. The one operation does not take place without the other, because that presence and communion are not vouchsafed except to that act of the soul by which through faith it feeds upon the body and blood of Christ. *And that presence and communion are vouchsafed to the end that the believer may receive the blessings that flow from that communion.* Practically, therefore, it is the same

[1] See p. 189 and 251 above.

thing to say that the body of Christ is received, and that the efficacy of that body has been received. The same operation of the Holy Spirit that produces one, produces the other; *and the latter is connected with and follows from the former, and is the consequence for the production of which the former takes place.*

Here again the great difficulty that stands in the way of the right understanding of this matter, arises from the mind attaching carnal and sensuous notions to the terms, eating the body of Christ, and the body of Christ being given to and received by our souls. The soul's eating is simply a metaphorical term to describe an act of faith; and the body is given and received, as our Church says, "only after a spiritual and heavenly manner." If we attempt to conceive of the nature of these acts by ideas derived from the eating of the mouth, and a substance being given to and received by the body, we shall imbibe most erroneous views of the nature of those spiritual matters here referred to. Let it be observed, that the doctrine of both parties is, that the body of Christ is given to and received by *the soul.* For, this the Romanists and the Authors under review hold as well as those opposed to them, though they *add* to that doctrine, that the body of Christ is *also* given to and received by *our bodies.* For they confess,[1] that it is the food of the soul, not of the body; and that the soul receives no benefit from the mere reception of the body of Christ by our body. They admit, that it is not given to and received by the soul whenever it is given to and received by the body; but that an act of faith is necessary to enable the soul to receive it. Now, what *is* this reception of the body of Christ by the soul? Can it be more, in the nature of things, than that spiritual union and communion we have been speaking of, through the operation of the Holy Spirit, by which the life-giving virtue that is in the glorified human nature of Christ is communicated to us? No presence, no gift, no reception, can be more *real* than this. Faith is the act of the soul, by which, on our part, the body of Christ is taken, received, and eaten, as once dead, but now living and glorified, to be the source of vital influence to all the members of his body. And by the agency of the Holy Spirit, there is a real spiritual union between the human nature of Christ and the believer. But then, what is actually received into the spiritual structure (so to speak) of the soul, is the

[1] See pp. 177, 178 above.

virtue of Christ's body communicated through the operation of the Holy Spirit. Just as in bodily eating (to give an illustration which, to a certain extent, will be found admissible), the body is brought, by eating, into contact with a certain substance; but what it receives into its interior organization is the virtue of the thing eaten. And in that spiritual eating, it is not as it is sometimes in bodily eating, that there may be reception of food without nourishment imparted, because the eating itself is the result of spiritual life and vigor, which ensures the effect of nourishment, or rather ensures the enjoyment of that gift, which it is the office of the Holy Spirit to impart to the believer.

Hence it is said by our Church, that a sacrament has two parts, an outward and visible sign, and an inward spiritual grace; and the reception of the sign is the means by which the faithful receive the inward spiritual grace; which grace is "the strengthening and refreshing of our souls by the Body and Blood of Christ, as our bodies are by the bread and wine." What we receive is spoken of in terms rather describing the reception of the inward spiritual grace than the reception of the body; the communication of this being the great object for which the rite was instituted.[1]

It was not meant by this phraseology to imply that the body and blood of Christ were *not* received, but only the grace or efficacy flowing from them; because the contrary is distinctly stated in the words that "the body and blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful;" but the grace is spoken of as the inward part of the sacrament, inasmuch as the communication of that grace is the great purpose in view in it, and is the object and result of the spiritual manducation of the body of Christ by the soul.

And therefore we find in the Fathers passages which mention only grace as the spiritual gift in the Eucharist as well as in the other sacrament.

Thus in the passage of Ephræm Patriarch of Antioch, quoted above,[2] it is a gift of *grace* which is said to be connected with the sacramental body of Christ.

[1] See the remarks on this point in pp. 186—190 above, where I have pointed out the discrepancy of the doctrine of the Authors under review in this point from that both of the antient Church and our own. [2] See p. 405 above.

And Augustine calls the sacraments, *sacraments of grace*;[1] and says that, while Moses sanctified "by the visible sacraments through his ministry," the Lord sanctified "by his invisible "grace through the Holy Spirit, whence comes the whole fruit "even of visible sacraments. For without that sanctification of "invisible grace, of what use are the visible sacraments?" [2]

And when Archdeacon Wilberforce comes to describe more particularly the nature and consequences of the reception of Christ's body in the Eucharist, he is compelled to adopt language which is tantamount to what I have just been using respecting it. For he says, that "Christ's body" "does not become part of *us*, but *we* become part of *Him*: He is not resolved as it were into the structure of our minds, but *we* pass, on the contrary, into his Divine organization .... the *res Sacramenti* is an energizing principle, which takes up and quickens that upon which it is bestowed." And he supports his view by the expression of Leo, (Serm. lxiii. 7.) that "the effect of participating of the Body and Blood of Christ is nothing else than that *we pass into* that which we receive;" and by that of Cyril of Alexandria, (Op. iv. 365.) that "the smallest portion of the Eucharist resolves our whole body *into itself*, and *fills us with its own energy*;" and he asserts that "the mystical Body of the Lord is *the extension of His Body natural*." [3]

Now this is, in fact, equivalent to saying, that our reception of the Body of Christ is like the reception of the root by the graft when it is inserted into it, or when it derives from it a fresh supply of the vital juice that flows from it. In other words, it is the production or renewal of union and communion with the Body of Christ, the Vine of which we are the engrafted branches, by which, in the words of Cyril, it takes our body into itself and fills us with its own energy.

And hence it is that the Fathers maintain, as I have already pointed out,[4] that the faithful eat the flesh of Christ and drink his blood in Baptism, because that is the rite in which, in the case of a faithful recipient, the graft is formally inserted into the Vine.

[1] See p. 252 above. [2] See p. 254 above.

[3] Wilb. On Eucharist, pp. 409—411. 3rd ed. pp. 352—354.

[4] See pp. 326—328 above.

## SECTION III.

### TESTIMONY OF THE ANTIENT LITURGIES.

Among the evidences appealed to both by the Romanists and the Authors under review,—the advocates of Transubstantiation and Consubstantiation,—to show that the Fathers held *their* doctrine of the Real Presence, a favorite class of proofs is derived from the language of some of the antient Liturgies.[1]

Now, so far as concerns the *authority* of these Liturgies, we must remark at the outset, that we have nothing remaining to us for which a higher antiquity is even claimed by learned men than the third century. Indeed, it is considered by Renaudot,[2] that none of the Greek Liturgies were committed to writing before the time of Basil; although he seems afterwards to make an exception in favor of the Liturgy inserted in the 8th book of the Apostolical Constitutions, said to be compiled by Clement of Rome, and compiled, according to Renaudot and others,[3] before the Nicene Council. This Liturgy is called the Clementine Liturgy, and is considered by Renaudot the most antient document of the kind in the Greek Church.[4]

These Liturgies, therefore, can hardly be considered as affording any satisfactory evidence as to what was the form in common use in Apostolic times, at the celebration of the Eucharist. Oral tradition being admitted to be the only means of conveyance use for three centuries, the forms that prevailed in the Church at the period when the Liturgy was first committed to writing, cannot be held to be sufficient proofs of the nature of the Service as it existed three centuries before. More particularly is this the case with respect to any part which is not common to *all* the most antient Liturgies we have remaining. And in the very part which is chiefly referred to on the point we are now considering, there is a discrepancy between them. For no invo-

[1] For the Authors under review, see Archd. Wilberforce's Doctrine of the Eucharist, ch. iii. pp. 48—72 (3rd ed. pp. 39—61), and ch. x. pp. 335—345 (3rd ed. pp. 288—297). Dr. Pusey's Sermon, pp. 66—68, and Notes on the Sermon, pp. 193, 194 and 251—257. Archd. Denison contents himself, as it respects the Fathers, (with very inconsiderable exceptions,) with a general reference to the above mentioned works of Archd. Wilberforce and Dr. Pusey.

[2] Si non certo, saltem verisimiliter omnino concluditur, ante Basilii tempora Liturgias Græcas literis non fuisse consignatas. RENAUDOT. Liturg. Orient. Coll. in Diss. de Lit. Or. orig. &c. tom. i. p. ix. ed. 1847.

[3] Ib. p. x. [4] Ib. p. ix.

cation of the Holy Spirit occurs in the most antient forms of the Roman Liturgy.

But I shall not now press the argument that might be derived from this source. I will take the Liturgies referred to, as they are, considering them as indicative of the views of a large portion of the Church in and after the third and fourth centuries, and thus of most of those Fathers whose doctrine we have just been endeavouring to ascertain. And we must, of course, view them in connexion with the testimonies given in the last Section of the doctrines held by those Fathers.

Reserving the question of the antiquity of the Form of the Eucharistic Service, given in what are called the *Constitutions of the Apostles* in the Æthiopian Church, as given by Ludolf,[1] (into which I shall not now enter) I am inclined to agree with Renaudot, that the Clementine Liturgy is, in substance, the most antient record of the form of the Eucharistic Service in the East, and, I may add, probably in the West. But as its use in any particular Church cannot be traced, it is considered by many as of less authority than some others.

The two Eastern Liturgies that stand next in age and authority are those attributed to St. James and St. Mark, as being the Liturgies used at an early period in the Churches of Jerusalem and Alexandria. None, however, I believe, claim a higher antiquity for even the substance of these Liturgies, as they now exist, than the third century, and they are usually referred to the fourth century.

The Liturgies attributed to Basil and Chrysostom are also of importance, as evidence of the Liturgical forms of a portion of the Church in their times. The former is apparently founded on that attributed to St. James, and the latter has a great similarity to that of Basil. The Liturgies attributed to Basil and Chrysostom are those now in use in what is called the Orthodox Greek Church.

From these Liturgies almost all the Oriental Liturgies appear to have been derived. And I suppose it will be admitted, that a consideration of the language of these Liturgies will give us a full view of the argument we are now to consider, so far as the Liturgies of the Eastern Churches are concerned.

[1] Ludolfi Comment. ad suam Hist. Æthiop. Francof. ad Mæn. 1691. fol. pp. 324—327.

For the Liturgies of the highest authority in the Western Church, we must refer to the most antient forms of the Roman, the Ambrosian, the Spanish, and the Gallican, so far as they remain to us.

In proceeding to consider the testimony of these Liturgies, I shall first meet the arguments derived from them in favor of the doctrine here controverted; and then point out some passages in them which appear opposed to it.

One preliminary remark it may be desirable to make, namely, to remind the reader, that the custom of the Fathers, so often referred to in the last Section, of calling the signs by the names of the things signified, must of course be expected to prevail in all their Liturgical Services. And the whole phraseology and tone of these Services must be expected to harmonise with this custom; in order to carry out the object they had in view, that is, that the minds of the people might be withdrawn from the signs and fixed upon the things signified.

The chief argument drawn from the antient Liturgies is derived from the language used in most, if not all, of the Oriental Liturgies, invocating the descent of the Holy Spirit upon the elements to sanctify them.[1] The prayer in most of them is, that He would make the bread the body, and the wine the blood, of our Blessed Saviour; and in that of Basil and Chrysostom and some others, the expression is *added*, that they may be *changed* into that Body and Blood.

The words used on this point, in the Liturgies just named, are as follows.

In the Clementine Liturgy the words are these:—

"Send down thy Holy Spirit upon this sacrifice, the witness of the sufferings of the Lord Jesus, that he may make manifest this bread as the body of thy Christ, and this cup as the blood of thy Christ; that they who partake of it may be strengthened for piety, obtain remission of sins," &c.[2]

[1] It would appear from the fragments published by Mabillon, that the antient Gallican Liturgies, which were probably derived from the East, had a similar invocation.

[2] Καὶ καταπέμψῃς τὸ ἅγιόν σου Πνεῦμα ἐπὶ τὴν θυσίαν ταύτην, τὸν μαρτύρα τῶν παθημάτων τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, ὅπως ἀποφήνῃ τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου, καὶ τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου, ἵνα οἱ μεταλαβόντες αὐτοῦ, βεβαιωθῶσι πρὸς εὐσέβειαν, ἀφέσεως ἁμαρτημάτων τύχωσι, κ. τ. λ. PSEUDO-CLEMENT. Liturg. in Constit. Apostol. lib. viii. c. 12. Inter Patr. Apostol. ed. Coteler. Amstel. 1724. tom. i. p. 407.

The words of the Liturgy attributed to St. James are these:—

"Send down, O Lord, thy most Holy Spirit upon us, and upon these holy gifts lying before us, that having come upon them with his holy and good and glorious presence, he may sanctify and make this bread the holy body of thy Christ, and this cup the precious blood of thy Christ." [1]

The Liturgy attributed to St. Mark words it thus:—

"Send forth moreover upon us, and upon these loaves, and upon these cups, thy Holy Spirit, that he may sanctify and perfect them, as the Omnipotent God; and make the bread the body, and the cup the blood of the New Testament of our Lord and God and Saviour and Supreme King himself, Jesus Christ." [2]

The words of the Liturgy of Basil are these:—

"And offering the antitypes of the holy Body and Blood of thy Christ, we beseech thee and entreat thee, O holy of holy ones, that, in the good pleasure of thy goodness, thy Holy Spirit may come upon us, and on these gifts lying before us, both to bless them and sanctify them, and constitute this bread the very precious body of our Lord and God and Saviour Jesus Christ, and this cup the very precious blood of our Lord and God and Saviour Jesus Christ, poured forth for the life of the world; having changed them by thy Holy Spirit." [3]

The Liturgy of Chrysostom runs thus:—

"Moreover, we offer to thee this reasonable and unbloody service,

[1] Αὐτὸ τὸ Πνεῦμά σου τὸ πανάγιον κατάπεμψον, δέσποτα, ἐφ' ἡμᾶς, καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ προκείμενα ἅγια δῶρα ταῦτα· ἵνα ἐπιφοίτησαν τῇ ἁγίᾳ καὶ ἀγαθῇ καὶ ἐνδόξῳ αὐτοῦ παρουσίᾳ ἁγιάσῃ καὶ ποιήσῃ, τὸν μὲν ἄρτον τοῦτον, σῶμα ἅγιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου· καὶ τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο, αἷμα τίμιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου. S. Jacobi Liturg. in J. A. Fabric. Cod. Apocr. Nov. Test. Hamburg. 1719. Pt. 3. p. 85.—I have omitted the rubrical directions interspersed among these words in this and the following extracts as of no moment to our present purpose.

[2] Ἔτι δὲ [i. e. ἐξαπόστειλον] ἐφ' ἡμᾶς, καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς ἄρτους τούτους, καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ ποτήρια ταῦτα, τὸ Πνεῦμά σου τὸ ἅγιον, ἵνα αὐτὰ ἁγιάσῃ καὶ τελειώσῃ, ὡς παντοδύναμος Θεός· καὶ ποιήσῃ τὸν μὲν ἄρτον σῶμα, τὸ δὲ ποτήριον, αἷμα τῆς Καινῆς Διαθήκης, αὐτοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ Θεοῦ καὶ Σωτῆρος καὶ παμβασιλέως ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. S. Marci Liturg. in Renaudot. Liturg. Orient. Collectio, ed. sec. Francof. ad Mœn. 1847. tom. i. pp. 141, 142, or, Fabric. Cod. Apocr. N. T. (ut supra cit.) p. 298.

[3] Καὶ προσθέντες τὰ ἀντίτυπα τοῦ ἁγίου σώματος καὶ αἵματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου, σοῦ δεόμεθα, καὶ σὲ παρακαλοῦμεν, Ἅγιε Ἁγίων, εὐδοκίᾳ τῆς σῆς ἀγαθότητος, ἐλθεῖν τὸ Πνεῦμά σου τὸ ἅγιον ἐφ' ἡμᾶς, καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ προκείμενα δῶρα ταῦτα, καὶ εὐλογῆσαι αὐτὰ, καὶ ἁγιάσαι, καὶ ἀναδεῖξαι τὸν μὲν ἄρτον τοῦτον, αὐτὸ τὸ τίμιον σῶμα τοῦ Κυρίου, καὶ Θεοῦ, καὶ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ· τὸ δὲ ποτήριον τοῦτο, αὐτὸ τὸ τίμιον αἷμα τοῦ Κυρίου, καὶ Θεοῦ, καὶ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τὸ ἐκχυθὲν ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ Κόσμου ζωῆς· μεταβαλὼν τῷ Πνεύματί σου τῷ Ἁγίῳ. Basil. Magn. Liturg. in Ἀρχιερατικὸν. Constantinop. 1820. fol. pp. 18, 19.

and we entreat and beseech and supplicate thee, send down the Holy Spirit on us, and on these gifts lying before us, and make this bread the precious body of thy Christ, and that which is in this cup the precious blood of thy Christ, having changed[1] them by thy Holy Spirit." [2]

Upon these passages I would first remark, that even from them we may observe how additions gradually crept in, strengthening the expressions used as to the effect of the consecration of the elements. In the earlier forms the term *change* is nowhere used, but in those of Basil[3] and Chrysostom we see this word *added* to those previously in use. And as we have already had occasion to notice, terms indicative of some sort of change were freely used by the Fathers of that period.[4]

But the question recurs, What was their *meaning* in the use of these words? What *sort of change* was contemplated by them?

And first I must observe, that *no language could be more thoroughly opposed to the doctrine of Dr. Pusey and Archdeacon Denison than that of these Liturgies.* For it clearly contemplates, as *the effect* of the descent of the Holy Spirit, a change of some kind or other passing upon the bread and wine. Now, according to Dr. Pusey and Archdeacon Denison, *the great effect* of

[1] Dr. Pusey translates it "changing;" but this is not the most correct translation of μεταβαλὼν. And as some Romanists ground an argument as to the time of consecration on its being in the past tense, it is but fair to give it its correct translation. It does not seem to me to make the slightest difference in the sense, the meaning being that the bread was to be *made* the body by *having been changed.*

[2] Ἔτι προσφέρομέν σοι τὴν λογικὴν ταύτην καὶ ἀναίμακτον λατρείαν, καὶ παρακαλοῦμεν, καὶ δεόμεθα, καὶ ἱκετεύομεν, κατάπεμψον τὸ Πνεῦμά σου τὸ Ἅγιον ἐφ' ἡμᾶς, καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ προκείμενα δῶρα ταῦτα· καὶ ποίησον τὸν μὲν ἄρτον τοῦτον, τίμιον σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου· τὸ δὲ ἐν τῷ ποτηρίῳ τούτῳ, τίμιον αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου· μεταβαλὼν τῷ Πνεύματί σου τῷ Ἁγίῳ. CHRYSOSTOMI Liturg. Ibid. p. 7.

[3] Dr. Pusey attributes this addition to Chrysostom, and says, that "words signifying 'change' only occur in certain Jacobite Liturgies, and those which are translated from the Liturgy of S. Chrysostom." (p. 253.) But this is a mistake, as the extract given above shows; which is taken from a work printed by authority at the Patriarchal press at Constantinople, and agrees with the form given in p. 169 of the Euchologium of Goar. There are, in fact, two somewhat different forms of Basil's Liturgy. One, that to which I have just referred, and which is used throughout the Patriarchate of Constantinople; and another, that used in the Patriarchate of Alexandria, which is given by Renaudot, and which has *not* the word in question; which has led probably to Dr. Pusey's remark.

[4] See pp. 395 et seq. above.

the consecration is the *junction* of our Lord's Body and Blood *with* the bread and wine. And it is manifest, that if their doctrine had been the doctrine of the Church at the time that these Liturgies were put forth, the prayer would have been, that the Holy Spirit would cause the Body and Blood of Christ to be *united to* the bread and wine, and not that the bread and wine should be made or changed into that Body and Blood.

And Dr. Pusey, when speaking of the language of the Liturgies, admits, that "the Fathers not only say, that the bread *becomes* the Body of Christ, but that it *is* the Body of Christ."[1] And he justly reminds the Romanists, that "this is inconsistent with conversion, as they believe it, or transubstantiation." But what is *his own* explanation? I give it in his own words:—

"The proposition, 'This bread is my Body,' could have no other meaning than that it was in some way, BOTH. 'This, which is in its natural substance, bread, is sacramentally my Body, through the presence of my Body under its form.'"[2]

But is this one whit more reasonable than the Roman Catholic interpretation? Let us try it in another case,—The proposition, "This picture is the Duke of Wellington," could have no other meaning than that it was in some way, *both.* "This, which is in its natural substance a picture, is in another way the Duke of Wellington, *through the presence of the Duke of Wellington under its form.*"

Is this sound reasoning?

There is no question that the bread is "in some way" both bread and the body of Christ, just as the picture is "in some way" both a picture and the Duke of Wellington; but as that "way," in the case of the picture, is clearly not "through the presence of the Duke of Wellington under its form," so in the case of the bread, it is not the body of Christ "through the presence of the body of Christ under its form." Dr. Pusey has assumed the very thing he had to prove, when he identifies a *sacramental* presence with the presence of the real Body under the form of the bread.

And, as I have before pointed out, Bellarmine candidly

[1] Doctr. of Real Pres. Vind. in Notes, &c. p 257.
[2] Ibid. p. 258.

admits, that it is only *figuratively* that bread can *be* the body of Christ.[1]

One thing, no doubt, can be "in some way" many things; for as it is one thing *really*, so, *figuratively*, or in some other way, it may be many things; but *really* and *substantially* one thing cannot be at the same time two different things, as one substance cannot be at the same time two different substances. And here lies the fallacy of Dr. Pusey's reasoning. For it supposes that one substance, bread, can *be* at the same time two different substances, namely, bread and the real substantial Body of Christ present in a spiritual form.

But the question remains, What is the *change* here referred to? In what way is it supposed that the bread and wine are *made* the Body and Blood of Christ?

There are three modes of answering this question. The *first* is that of the Romanists, who tell us, that the bread and wine become by transubstantiation the Body and Blood of Christ; the Body and Blood of Christ being substituted for the substance of the bread and wine, and lying hid under their accidents. The *second* is that advocated by, among others, Johnson, a favorer of the Non-jurors, and is this; that the lifegiving virtue of the Body and Blood of Christ is communicated by the Holy Spirit to the bread and wine, which are thus *virtually*, but not *substantially*, the Body and Blood of Christ. The *third* is, that the bread and wine are changed in *character*, *use*, and *effect*, so as to be effectual in the case of all faithful communicants, through the Divine blessing, for making their recipients partakers of the Body and Blood of Christ, by bringing them into communion with them, and thus become *sacramentally* and *in effect* the Body and Blood of Christ.

Now as to the first of these, it is clearly negatived by the testimonies of the Fathers given in the last section, particularly by those that show that they believed the substance of the elements to remain, and also their power of nourishing.[2]

As it respects the second, I might here pass it over, for neither the Romanists nor the Authors under review are inclined to look upon it with the least favor. And the doctrine is very different from, and open to far less objection than, that of a real

[1] See pp. 71, 72 above.

[2] See pp. 391—395 above.

substantial presence of our Lord's Body in, or with, or under the forms of the bread and wine. And some passages might be quoted from the antient Liturgies, which, taken alone, and viewed apart from those general considerations which ought to guide us in judging of the meaning of the Fathers in such matters, might appear to favor the view.

Thus in the Liturgy of St. James, in the words of institution (as they are called) relating to the cup, the language is, that our Lord "taking the cup . . . sanctifying it, blessing it, *filling it with the Holy Ghost*," &c.[1]

And the same words are used in the same place in the Liturgy of St. Mark.[2]

And Dr. Pusey mentions a prayer "ascribed to S. Gregory," which runs thus:—"As Thou hast vouchsafed to *fill with all* "*holiness* these thy most holy and precious gifts through the "illapse of thy Holy Spirit, so vouchsafe also to sanctify the "souls, bodies, spirits of thy faithful servants."[3]

But as, in the case of similar language used by the Fathers, (which has been already noticed[4]) the use of the same phraseology with respect to the water of baptism seems clearly to indicate, that nothing more was meant than a change of *character, use,* and *effect,* so we may argue here; especially when we find, that this reasoning enables us to give a more consistent interpretation to all their various statements.

In endeavouring to ascertain the real meaning of the Fathers in the use of these words in their Liturgies, we must take into account the doctrine clearly maintained by them in the passages quoted from them in the last Section.

We have, therefore, to interpret the phraseology of these Liturgies so as to make it consistent with the views set forth in those passages. Now it appears from them, that the Fathers held, (among other like views) that what our Lord gave to his disciples was bread and wine:[5] that what is called the Lord's body in the Eucharist is bread, and what is called his blood is wine;[6] that the consecrated sacramental substances in the Eucharist are

[1] Πλήσας Πνεύματος ἁγίου. S. JACOBI Liturg. ed. Fabr. ut supra cit. p. 81.
[2] Ib. p. 295. [3] Doctr. of Real Pres. in Notes, &c., p. 256.
[4] See 27th head of the last Section, pp. 395 et seq. above.
[5] See pp. 235—237 above. [6] See pp.237—240 above.

*figures, signs, symbols,* of the Body and Blood of Christ;[1] that Christ is *absent* from us so far as his *human nature* is concerned, and present only by his divinity;[2] and that his risen body can only be in one place;[3] that the real flesh and blood of Christ are not eaten and drunk orally in the Eucharist;[4] but that the act of eating and drinking the real body and blood of Christ in the Eucharist is a spiritual act, an act of the soul through faith;[5] and that the wicked do not eat and drink the real body and blood of Christ;[6] to all which the notion of a real substantial presence of Christ's Body and Blood in the elements is directly opposed.

And we are told, that the Holy Spirit *supplies the place of the presence and power of Christ, dwelling in his saints.*[7] But if the real body of Christ is substantially present, though in a spiritual form, so as to be received even into the mouth of the communicant, and thus, by its actual presence within men, to impart to them itself its efficacy and virtue, Christ's place is not supplied by the Holy Spirit. There is an irreconcileable contradiction between the two notions. Nor is that contradiction in the slightest degree removed by the statement that this supposed real presence of Christ's body is produced by the operation of the Holy Spirit. For it matters not *how* the presence is produced. If it is produced at all, the office assigned to the Holy Spirit, of *supplying the place* of Christ's presence and power, is taken away.

And I must here again remind the reader, of a remark I have already had occasion to make,[8] that a real substantial presence of the Body and Blood of Christ is not *the sort of presence* which would be attributable to the operation of the Holy Spirit. A virtual presence in the elements might be brought about by the agency of the Holy Spirit, but a real substantial presence of the Body and Blood upon the Table would no more be attributed to the Holy Spirit than our Lord's presence to his disciples on earth after his resurrection.

Our best guide in determining the meaning of the language used is surely a comparison of it with the language used with

[1] See pp. 260—280 above.
[2] See pp. 297—309 above.
[3] See pp. 309—316 above.
[4] See pp. 328—336 above.
[5] See pp. 336—350 above.
[6] See pp. 350 et seq.
[7] See p. 304 above.
[8] See pp. 427, 428 above.

reference to the other sacrament. And, as I have already shown by very abundant proofs,[1] the strongest terms which the Fathers use to denote a change in the Eucharistic elements are also used by them with reference to the water of baptism, in which no one supposes any other change to be made, than that from common water it becomes changed in its character, use, and effect, being consecrated to a sacred purpose, and operating, through the Divine blessing, to produce effects for which naturally it had no power.

Thus Cyril of Alexandria says, that the water of Baptism is "transelemented (μεταστοιχειοῦται) into a certain Divine and unspeakable power, and thenceforth sanctifies those to whom it may be applied."[2] Cyril of Jerusalem says, that "the water having received power [or, virtue] on the invocation of the Holy Spirit and Christ, obtains sanctity."[3] So Chrysostom tells us, that "the water does not work by itself; but when it *receives the grace of the Spirit*, then it washes away all sins."[4] "The bread and the oil," says Theodotus, "are changed by power into a spiritual power. So also the water . . . receives the addition of sanctification."[5] So Tertullian tells us, that when "the Spirit comes over them from heaven and rests upon the waters . . . the waters thus sanctified *imbibe the power of sanctifying*."[6] And many similar passages abound in the Fathers, of which we have already given abundant instances.[7]

Now, notwithstanding the undeniable meaning of these passages, if the words are taken in their literal sense, no one supposes that the Fathers meant, that the change implied in these words when literally interpreted, passed upon the water itself used in Baptism. The words are interpreted as only meaning that the water used in Baptism is changed by consecration in its *character use* and *effect*, so as to be *instrumentally* productive of the effects which here seem attributed to an energy and power *imbibed* by it.

Here, then, surely we have the best evidence what was their meaning when they used similar language respecting the bread and wine of the Eucharist, especially when we find that such an

[1] See pp. 395 et seq. above. [2] See p. 398, 399 above. [3] See p. 400 above.
[4] See p. 403 above. [5] See p. 404 above. [6] See p. 406 above.
[7] See the 27th head of the last Section, pp. 395 et seq. above.

interpretation alone harmonizes their various statements on the subject.

And this inferential argument is greatly increased in force when we find that the words used to describe the change are (as I have already shown[1]) frequently used, with reference to other things, to denote changes in which only the *character*, *use*, *operation* or *effect* of the thing is changed.

One thing certainly is clear, that no one can insist upon the words being taken in their most literal sense when applied to the Eucharistic elements, who refuses to take them in the same sense as applied to the element used in baptism.

And we have satisfactory testimony that in the Æthiopic Church, where the prayers that the bread might be *converted* into the Body of Christ and the wine *changed* so as to become his blood, were as strong as in any of the antient Liturgies,[2] nothing more was understood by the Æthiopic Church to be meant, than that "the common bread and wine appeared to them "to be changed into that which had a mystery in it, and was "*representative* of the body and blood of Jesus Christ, and so "was changed from what was common into that which was "sacred, so as to *represent* to the communicants the true body "and blood of Christ."[3]

If I needed another argument, derived from the authority of learned men, I might find it in the interpretation given to these words by some of the Romanists. I must admit, however, that I do not attribute much weight to it, as it appears to arise out of their desire to maintain their doctrine that the consecration of the elements is effected and perfected by the words, "This is my body," &c. But certainly Goar makes the great object of the invocation to be, not the consecration of the elements, either wholly or partly, *that* having been, in his view, completely effected before, but to raise the mind of the priest from earthly to heavenly things, and prepare the people to receive the Sacrament more worthily.[4] And though he adds various other reasons[5] why the

[1] See 27th head of last Section, pp. 395 et seq. above.
[2] Ludolf. Hist. Æthiop. lib. iii. c. 5. § 49 et seq. Francof. 1681. fol.
[3] Ibid. quoted pp. 275, 276, above.
[4] Goar, Εὐχολογιὸν, sive Rituale Græcorum. Paris. 1647. p. 139.
[5] Ibid. pp. 140—142.

invocation should take place, he gives none that attribute any operative force to it in respect of the elements themselves.

And Archdeacon Wilberforce admits, that "others,"—among whom he particularizes "De Lugo de Eucharistia, disp. xi. sec. i."—(though he does not agree with them), "have affirmed the Invocation not to refer to the elements, but to the receiver, and to be equivalent to a prayer that he may receive profitably."[1]

As I have stated, I do not attribute much weight to these remarks, nor am I disposed to adopt them. But thus much I think we may infer from these explanations;—That if learned men, well versed in Ecclesiastical literature and the antiquities of the Christian Church, can maintain, that, in the interpretation of these expressions, general considerations of doctrine must be brought in to show us their true meaning, and teach us not to rest in the first sense of the words, we have some ground for supposing, that we must take into account the general doctrines and practices of the early Church, and the object the Fathers had in view in using the phraseology they did, before we positively determine the meaning of their general language in their Liturgical offices.

It is also urged,[2] that after the consecration of the elements, they are spoken of as being the Body and Blood of Christ, and the communicants are spoken of as receiving the holy and precious Body and Blood of Christ.

But this language is only that which is suitable to the nature of the rite, and to the known practice of the Fathers to call the signs by the names of the things signified by them.[3]

And in the midst of this application of the terms *the Body and Blood of Christ* to the consecrated elements, as the appropriate sacramental names for them, and considered the best fitted to sustain the devotional feelings of the communicants, we find language not obscurely indicating the real doctrine held by those who used them. Thus in Basil's Liturgy occurs the prayer,—

[1] Wilb. Doctr. of Euch. p. 341; or, 3rd ed. p. 294.

[2] See Dr. Pusey's Sermon, p. 67; and Wilb. Doctr. of Euch. p. 335; or, 3rd ed. p. 289.

[3] See pp. 247—249, above.

"Cleanse us, &c. . . . . that we receiving a portion of the things which thou hast consecrated with a clear testimony of our consciences, may be united to the holy Body and Blood of thy Christ; and having received them worthily, may have Christ dwelling in our hearts, and become a temple of thy Holy Spirit." [1]

A prayer that the consecrated things may be so received as that the recipients *may be united to* the Body and Blood of Christ, is not like the language of one who holds the doctrine of the Authors under review.

Archdeacon Wilberforce finds another argument in the Oriental Liturgies, against the notion that we are to raise our minds to heaven as the abode of the real Body of Christ, in the fact, that the *descent* of the Holy Spirit upon the elements and their sanctification are invoked; and observes, that "the antient Services" "suppose Christ to descend through the agency of his Spirit upon earth," while "the modern" "suppose men to ascend through the action of their spirits into heaven;" and that in the former "Christ is supposed to bestow an actual gift, which men may accept or reject, and which is equally bestowed upon all;" but according to the latter, "no gift at all is bestowed through the ordinance itself." [2]

Now, as it respects the first supposed discrepancy, no such exists; for a uniform characteristic of all these Liturgies is the direction to lift up our hearts to heaven; [3] and therefore, as Archdeacon Wilberforce himself testifies that such an exhortation is inconsistent with his view of the nature of the Eucharistic rite, he has himself to meet the difficulty which the antient Liturgies present to his doctrine on this ground. And, as I have shown, [4] the Fathers constantly use similar language, admonishing us that "he who approaches to this body must have his mind aloft;" that "we have our victim above, our priest above, our sacrifice above," and that Christ is "absent" in heaven, and only to be laid hold of by faith. They assert constantly, that Christ is absent

[1] Καθάρσον ἡμᾶς, κ. τ. λ. . . . . ἵνα ἐν καθαρᾷ τῷ μαρτυρίῳ τῆς συνειδήσεως ἡμῶν ὑποδεχόμενοι τὴν μερίδα τῶν Ἁγιασμάτων σου, ἑνωθῶμεν τῷ ἁγίῳ Σώματι καὶ Αἵματι τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου· καὶ ὑποδεξάμενοι αὐτὰ ἀξίως, σχῶμεν τὸν Χριστὸν κατοικοῦντα ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν, καὶ γενώμεθα ναὸς τοῦ Ἁγίου σου Πνεύματος. BASIL. MAGN. Liturg. loc. cit. p. 21.

[2] Doctr. of Euch. p. 71; or, 3rd ed. p. 60.

[3] See pp. 316—318, above.

[4] See pp. 318—321, above.

from us so far as his human nature is concerned,[1] and that his risen body can only be in one place,[2] and that the Holy Spirit supplies the place of Christ's presence and power.[3]

As it respects the second supposed discrepancy, it arises entirely from the supposition that the meaning and effect of the invocation of the Holy Spirit's descent upon the elements is, that the real body and blood of Christ may be so joined to the elements or substituted for their substance, as that no one can swallow the one without, in so doing, swallowing the other also. This notion, however, is one which has been abundantly disposed of, not merely in the remarks just made as to the meaning of the invocation, but by the testimonies adduced in the last section.

Archdeacon Wilberforce also lays great stress upon the way in which the words, "This is my body," &c., which he calls, "the words of institution," and "the words of consecration," are repeated in all the antient Liturgies, and intimates that it clearly shows, that they were considered as effecting a change in the bread and wine such that the real Body and Blood of Christ became present in or under them.

This argument appears to me to be grounded upon two remarkable mistakes. For first he tells us, that "in the antient Liturgies the words of consecration were quoted literally, and not in the way of narration: they were made part of a prayer, and the people were enjoined to answer, Amen," while "in the Calvinistic formularies" "we have a narration," &c.[4]

Now the fact is, that in all the five Liturgies quoted above, the words *are* uttered in the way of narration, as part of an account of what our Blessed Lord did and said when instituting the rite. In all these Liturgies (not to mention others) an account of our Lord's mode of instituting the Eucharist is given as strictly historical and narrative as that which occurs in the Gospels, and the words in question occur just in the same way as they occur in the Gospels. It is true that the people say *Amen* at the end of the Eucharistic prayer or thanksgiving in which they occur, but this does not affect the point in question.

[1] See pp. 297—309, above.
[2] See pp. 309—316, above.
[3] See p. 304, above.
[4] Doctr. of Euch. p. 66; or, 3rd ed. p. 55.

There is not the slightest ground, then, for his statements that these words were "pleaded before God for the attainment of the promise," and that they were "words of power,"[1] &c.

These statements are merely copied from the Romanists, who, though their own "Canon of the Mass" retains pretty nearly the old form, contrive to make the priest so *pronounce* the words, "This is my Body," &c., as if they did not form part of a narrative, but were uttered by the priest as the representative of our Blessed Lord.

But any one who looks to the words of these Liturgies will see at once, that the words occur as words narrating what our Lord did; and an attempt to *act* the narrative does not alter its nature.

And that no such conclusion can be drawn from the way in which these words are used, as Archdeacon Wilberforce has deduced, will appear still more clearly from the manifest fact, that in the Oriental Liturgies the elements are *not* supposed to be consecrated by the use of these words.

And this leads me to what I must take the liberty of calling the second mistake of Archdeacon Wilberforce in this matter; namely, his argument from the antient Liturgies as to the effective power of the words of institution alone to consecrate the elements and make them the Body and Blood of Christ. So far are they from bearing witness to this doctrine, that it is clear from the language of the Oriental Liturgies, that in the whole of the Eastern Church (so far as the existing Liturgies are to be taken as our guide in this respect) the elements were not supposed to be consecrated till after the invocation of the Holy Spirit. The passages quoted, in a former page, from John Damascene, and the Acts of the Second Nicene Council,[2] show that this was the case. And I may add here, that the proscribed Council of Constantinople (whose testimony in this respect will not, I suppose, be questioned) expressly speak of "the bread of the Eucharist" being "sanctified [or, consecrated] by the illapse of the Holy Spirit upon it."[3]

[1] Doctr. of Euch. p. 67; or, 3rd ed. p. 56.

[2] See pp. 279, 280, above.

[3] Τὸν τῆς εὐχαριστίας ἄρτον, ὡς ἀψευδῆ εἰκόνα τῆς φυσικῆς σαρκὸς, διὰ τῆς τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος ἐπιφοιτήσεως ἁγιαζόμενον, θεῖον σῶμα εὐδόκησε [i. e. Χριστὸς] γίνεσθαι. Conc. Nic. Sec. Act. vi. Inter Concil. ed. Hard. iv. 368.

The Archdeacon evidently feels the force of this difficulty, but will not allow it to deprive him of so favorite an argument; and is consequently driven to the use of terms very inconsistent with one another. For while he speaks in one page of the words of institution effecting the consecration, he is compelled in another,[1] when speaking of the Eastern Liturgies, to speak of "the invocation of the Holy Ghost" as "part of the form of consecration."

His explanation of the difficulty is this:—

"So completely does each [Person of the Ever-blessed Trinity] co-operate in that which either performs, that we cannot exclude the Holy Ghost from that action which is performed by the Son through the medium of his priests, nor yet the Son from that which is effected by the Holy Ghost who proceeds from him. So that it would be rash perhaps to define at what moment the act of consecration is effected, while yet *it is reverent to treat it as effected, when the first essential portion of it is performed.* Again, it may be said, that since our Lord's presence in this holy ordinance is not of a natural or carnal character, the continual agency of the Spirit is no doubt required to perpetuate that operation on which Christ's presence is dependent. As we daily ask God, therefore, to send down his 'mercy and truth,' without meaning that similar prayers may not have been already heard, so we may invoke the power of the Spirit for the *maintenance* of that presence, which is *already bestowed.* So that the Invocation of the Holy Ghost may be designed to imply, that the continuance of our Lord's presence is a supernatural action momentarily renewed."[2]

This may be ingenious, but can hardly, I think, claim higher praise. And I must remind Archdeacon Wilberforce, that it is certainly opposed to the views expressed by those authorities of the Greek Church whom I have just quoted, who expressly maintained, that the consecration was not effected before the invocation; and argued on that ground, that the elements might

[1] Doctr. of Euch. p. 69. 3rd ed. p. 58.

[2] Doctr. of Euch. pp. 342, 343; 3rd ed. p. 295, 296. Goar, in his "Euchologium, sive Rituale Græcorum," (Paris. 1647. pp. 139—142), labours hard to the same effect, giving divers reasons why, notwithstanding that the consecration of the elements is completely effected and perfected by the words "This is my Body," &c., the Holy Spirit may be afterwards invoked to consecrate them. But it is waste of time to discuss at length learned arguments whose sole object is to obscure plain facts and truths.

be called types or images before that invocation, but not after.

In the face of these authorities and the precise language of the Liturgies, it seems to me useless to allege Chrysostom (as Archdeacon Wilberforce has done[1]) as intimating in some of his homilies that the consecration is effected by the words of institution *alone*. Such statements, *if genuine*, must be explained in accordance with the facts of the case. And his own Liturgy shows, that he did not consider the consecration to be perfected before the invocation.

The Archdeacon tells us, that "St. Augustine attributes it with equal distinctness to the one and to the other."[2] But his references do not in the least bear out this assertion. For the passage to which he refers[3] as attributing it to the invocation of the Holy Spirit, says nothing of the invocation, but only speaks of the invisible operation of the Holy Spirit in the consecration.

But the importance of the point to Archdeacon Wilberforce lies in this, that it is a necessary foundation for his argument that in the antient Church the real body and blood of Christ were offered as a sacrifice to God in the Eucharist. For as the offering of the elements took place before the invocation, if they were not consecrated till the invocation, it is clear that it was the bread and wine only that were offered; which is destructive of the Archdeacon's theory. Relying, however, I suppose, upon the explanation I have just quoted from him, he boldly tells us (as I have already had occasion to notice[4]), that "the antient Church supposed the offering presented in the Holy Eucharist to consist not of the *sacramentum* only, but of the *res sacramenti* also."[5]

I think I may safely leave this assertion, made in the very face of the whole body of the Liturgies of the Oriental Church, to be dealt with by the reader.

The following passage, however, from the Liturgy of St. James, may be an additional confirmation of the truth of what I have been contending for, namely, that the offering was of the *unconsecrated* elements, and that the consecration was not perfected

[1] Doctr. of Euch. p. 344; or, 3rd ed. p. 296.
[2] Ibid.
[3] AUGUST. De Trin. iii. 10. (c. 4.) quoted p. 433, above.
[4] See p. 279, above.
[5] Doctr. of Euch. p. 389; or, 3rd ed. p. 335.

until the invocation of the Holy Spirit. In a prayer at the latter part of that Liturgy occur the following words:—

"Thou hast accepted for an odour of sweet spiritual savour the oblations, gifts, and offerings of fruits presented to thee, and hast vouchsafed, O gracious God, to sanctify and perfect them by the grace of thy Christ and the illapse of thy most Holy Spirit." [1]

Let us now proceed to notice some passages in these Liturgies *opposed* to the notion of a real substantial presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in or with or under the forms of the bread and wine.

First, we have the admonition to be found in all the old Liturgies, to lift up our hearts, that is, as the Fathers themselves explain the words, to lift them up to heaven; whereas, if there is a real bodily presence of Christ on the Table, and the benefits of the Eucharist flow from our taking that into our mouths, and by faith feeding upon it as lying in our mouths or stomachs, our minds ought to be fixed upon that which is on the Table, and we have nothing to do with heaven in the matter. But as I have already noticed this argument,[2] I shall not again dwell upon it in this place.

Further, in the Clementine Liturgy a prayer is offered after the completion of the consecration by the invocation of the Holy Spirit, that God would accept the gifts that had been offered, through the mediation of Christ.

The words are these:—

"Let us beseech God through his Christ in behalf of the gift that has been brought to the Lord God; that the good God will receive it, *through the mediation of his Christ*, at his heavenly altar, for the savour of a sweet smell." [3]

[1] Τὰ μὲν προσενεχθέντα σοι δῶρα, δόματα, καρπώματα εἰς ὀσμὴν εὐωδίας πνευματικῆς προσδέξω, καὶ ἁγιάσαι καὶ τελειῶσαι κατηξίωσας, ἀγαθὲ, τῇ χάριτι τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου, καὶ τῇ ἐπιφοιτήσει τοῦ παναγίου σου Πνεύματος. S. Jacobi Liturg. loc. cit. p. 98.

[2] See pp. 316—321 above.

[3] Ἔτι καὶ ἔτι δεηθῶμεν τοῦ Θεοῦ διὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ, ὑπὲρ τοῦ δώρου τοῦ προσκομισθέντος Κυρίῳ τῷ Θεῷ, ὅπως ὁ ἀγαθὸς Θεὸς προσδέξηται αὐτὸ διὰ τῆς μεσιτείας τοῦ Χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ ἐπουράνιον αὐτοῦ θυσιαστήριον, εἰς ὀσμὴν εὐωδίας. Pseudo-Clem. Rom. Constit. Apost. lib. viii. c. 13. Inter Patr. Apost. ed. Cotel. 1724. vol. i. p. 408.

Now if the elements were considered as so changed by consecration as to be or include the real Body and Blood of Christ, it is inconceivable that such a prayer should have been offered. For, first, if the gifts, when offered, were so changed, this would have been a prayer that God would accept the Body and Blood of Christ, and would do so through the mediation of Christ. The presumption of men praying that God would accept Christ's offering, is what I believe no priesthood has as yet professedly reached. For the prayer is, not that the gift may be accepted *on their behalf*, but, absolutely, that it may be an acceptable gift. And, secondly, if the change came *after and upon* the invocation, still this prayer, *succeeding* the invocation, would be absurd; because the real Body and Blood of Christ would have been in their hands for presentation.

There are also several phrases in the Liturgy of Basil similarly inconsistent with the doctrine here opposed. Thus, after the completion of the consecration by the invocation of the Holy Spirit, it speaks of those "who partake of the one *bread* and *cup*."[1] And it prays, as I have already pointed out,[2] that those who receive the consecrated substances "*may be* united to the holy Body and Blood of Christ." And, above all, the priest is actually instructed to pray, that God "will not, on account of his sins, *prevent the grace of his Holy Spirit from resting on the gifts lying before him*."[3] How is it possible that such a prayer could be offered, if those gifts had been previously changed into the real Body and Blood of Christ to be received by all the communicants? And this occurs in a Liturgy in which is found the phrase "having changed them by thy Holy Spirit;" which shows that these words must be interpreted in the modified sense given to them above.

Moreover, in the Rubrical directions of these Liturgies, after the completion of the consecration by the invocation of the Holy Spirit, the bread is still called *bread* as before. Thus, in that of St. James it is said, "Then the priest breaks *the bread*,"

[1] Τοὺς ἐκ τοῦ ἑνὸς ἄρτου καὶ τοῦ ποτηρίου μετέχοντας. Ἀρχιερατικὸν (ut supra cit.) p. 19.

[2] See p. 451 above.

[3] Μὴ διὰ τὰς ἐμὰς ἁμαρτίας κωλύσῃς τὴν χάριν τοῦ ἁγίου σου Πνεύματος ἀπὸ τῶν προκειμένων δώρων. Ἀρχ. p. 21.

&c.[1] "And when he signs *the bread*, he says," &c.[2] In that of St. Mark it is said, "And the priest breaks *the bread*, and says," &c.[3]

In the Liturgies of Chrysostom and Basil as given in the Ἀρχιερατικὸν, printed at the Patriarchal Press at Constantinople, and quoted above, there are not the ordinary Rubrical directions; but in the Liturgy of Chrysostom, as published by Goar in his Εὐχολογιὸν, and as it ordinarily occurs in the Service-books of the Greek Church printed at Venice, and in the Liturgy of Basil as used in the Alexandrian Patriarchate, and published by Renaudot in his "Liturgiarum Orientalium Collectio," the consecrated bread is repeatedly called *bread* in the rubric after the completion of the consecration.

And in considering such testimony, we must not allow ourselves to be deluded by the reply sometimes made to such arguments by the Romanists, when they urge, that *they* also sometimes use such language, though not holding the doctrine which it seems to us to indicate. Because *they* use this language in order to prove their agreement with antiquity, and are *obliged* to do so to support their claim of consent in doctrine with the primitive Church. But the question for us is, whether such language would have been *originated* by those who held the doctrine here opposed. And I think every impartial reader will admit, that there is no probability that such would have been the case, but that the early Church, if it had held that doctrine, would have carefully avoided the use of a term so unsuitable to the case.

There is also in the Liturgies of Chrysostom and Basil, as given by Goar, and in the Venice editions of the Service-books of the Greek Church, a prayer very inconsistent with the notion that the blessing obtained in the Eucharist is through any oral reception of the Body and Blood of Christ in or under the elements.

The prayer (which is the same in both Liturgies) is this, and it occurs after the completion of the consecration:—

"Let us beseech the Lord for the precious gifts that have been

[1] Εἶτα κλᾷ τὸν ἄρτον ὁ ἱερεὺς, κ. τ. λ. loc. cit. p. 104.

[2] Καὶ ὅταν σφραγίζῃ τὸν ἄρτον, λέγει, κ. τ. λ. Ib. p. 105.

[3] Καὶ κλάζει ὁ ἱερεὺς τὸν ἄρτον, καὶ λέγει, κ. τ. λ. loc. cit. p. 145; or, in Fabric. p. 306.

brought and consecrated.....Let us beseech the Lord, that our merciful God, who has received them upon his holy and supercelestial and intellectual altar, for the odour of a spiritual sweet savour, may *send down upon* US *in return his divine grace, and the gift of his most holy Spirit.*" [1]

This is a prayer quite inconsistent with the notion that the Eucharistic blessing comes to us through our oral reception into our bodies of the real body and blood of Christ, and our participation of the Holy Spirit *in that way.*

A still further illustration of the meaning of the language used in the antient Liturgies may be obtained from the Æthiopian Liturgy, as given by Renaudot.

After having given the words of our Lord, spoken at the institution of the Eucharist, as being, "This *bread* is my body which is broken," &c. (the argument derivable from which I have already noticed [2]) it gives the response of the people as follows:—

"Amen, Amen, Amen. We believe and are sure, we praise thee, O Lord our God, this is truly, and so we believe, thy body." [3]

The response is similar respecting the cup.

Judging from the words of the response, an argument might be raised from them, that they were intended to imply that the bread and wine had been made in some way the real Body and Blood of our Saviour. In fact, Dr. Pusey urges this argument from similar words occurring in another Liturgy.[4]

But on proceeding a little further on in the same Liturgy, we find the following prayer:—

"We entreat and beseech thee, O Lord, to send the Holy Spirit and power upon this bread and upon this cup, and may He make

[1] Ὑπὲρ τῶν προσκομισθέντων καὶ ἁγιασθέντων τιμίων δώρων τοῦ Κυρίου δεηθῶμεν.....Ὅπως ὁ φιλάνθρωπος Θεὸς ἡμῶν, ὁ προσδεξάμενος αὐτὰ εἰς τὸ ἅγιον, καὶ ὑπερουράνιον, καὶ νοερὸν αὐτοῦ θυσιαστήριον εἰς ὀσμὴν εὐωδίας πνευματικῆς, ἀντικαταπέμψῃ ἡμῖν τὴν θείαν χάριν, καὶ τὴν δωρεὰν τοῦ παναγίου Πνεύματος, τοῦ Κυρίου δεηθῶμεν. Εὐχολογιὸν, sive Rituale Græcorum, ed. Goar. Paris. 1647. fol. pp. 79 and 173.

[2] See p. 240 above.

[3] Hic panis est corpus meum, quod pro vobis frangitur in remissionem peccatorum. Amen. *Populus*: Amen, Amen, Amen. Credimus et certi sumus, laudamus te Domine Deus noster, hoc est vere, et ita credimus, corpus tuum. RENAUDOT. Liturg. Orient. Coll. ed. cit. tom. i. p. 490.

[4] Sermon, p. 67.

them both the body and blood of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ for ever and ever. Amen." [1]

I need hardly observe, that this prayer is quite inconsistent with the argument raised out of the preceding words. And the case shows the impossibility of drawing any sound conclusions as to the doctrine held from a literal interpretation of such expressions.

It is impossible for any one carefully to examine these documents of the early Church, and not see, that there was a strong tendency in such matters to use expressions that were not intended to be taken in their literal sense, but were used for the purpose of raising the thoughts of the worshipper from what was visibly before them to the high and heavenly things which they represented. And there is sufficient even in the few Liturgies we have just noticed, if we compare them, to show how an advance was gradually made in this direction. The Clementine, for instance, is much more simple than the later forms going under the names of St. James and St. Mark, and the word *change* is not found in any of the Liturgies previous to those of Basil and Chrysostom.

And here I would notice the Form to which I have alluded in a previous page,[2] which is found in a work belonging to the Æthiopian Church, called "The Constitutions of the Apostles," as published by Ludolf, and which appears to me to have far the best claim to be considered the most antient of those now extant.

In the "Eucharistic prayer," after offering thanks to God for his mercy in sending his Son into the world, we have the usual account of the words used by our Blessed Lord at the institution of the Supper; and then follow these words:—

"Remembering therefore his death and his resurrection, we offer to Thee this bread and cup, giving thanks to Thee that Thou hast rendered us worthy to stand before Thee and perform to Thee the priestly office. We humbly beseech Thee to send thy Holy Spirit on

[1] Rogamus te, Domine, et deprecamur te, ut mittas Sanctum Spiritum et virtutem super hunc panem, et super hunc calicem, faciatque utrumque corpus et sanguinem Domini et Salvatoris nostri Jesu Christi, in sæcula sæculorum. Amen. Ibid.

[2] See p. 440 above.

the oblations of this Church, and equally to bestow holiness upon all who partake of them, that they may be filled with the Holy Spirit, and for the confirmation of their faith in the truth, that they may worship and praise Thee in Thy Son Jesus Christ," &c.[1]

Not a word occurs here about the elements being made the Body and Blood of our Saviour.

And in the prayers that succeed, the communicants are spoken of as receiving "the holy *sacrament of* the Body and Blood of Christ,"[2] or "the holy mystery [or, sacrament];"[3] but nowhere, throughout the whole of it, are the terms, Body and Blood of Christ, applied to the elements.

It is, of course, impossible to prove the age of this Form; but I think the impartial reader will consider its superior simplicity as the best evidence of its superior antiquity. At any rate there it is, confessedly a very antient Form, and certainly bearing testimony against the notion that the doctrine here opposed was held by those who used it.

As it respects the Liturgies of the Western Church, I do not think it necessary here to enter into an examination of the remains of the most antient Forms. Of these, nothing, as far as I can find, survives, which, in the form in which it has come down to us, can claim a higher antiquity than the fifth century. And it seems to me unnecessary to refer to them, inasmuch as the Liturgy now in use in the Romish Church is quite sufficient for our present purpose. For, even the "Canon of the Mass," as it now stands, and which is, no doubt, of considerable antiquity, does not bear out the notion that the elements themselves become, upon consecration, the real body and blood of Christ. There are clear evidences in it of purer doctrine than that which now rules in the Church of Rome; evidences which her claim of agree-

[1] Recordantes igitur mortis ejus et resurrectionis ejus, offerimus Tibi hunc panem et calicem, gratias agentes Tibi, quod nos reddidisti dignos, ut stemus coram Te, et sacerdotio Tibi fungamur. Suppliciter oramus Te, ut mittas Spiritum tuum Sanctum super oblationes hujus Ecclesiæ; pariterque largiaris omnibus, qui sumunt de iis, sanctitatem; ut repleantur Spiritu Sancto, et ad confirmationem fidei in veritate, ut te celebrent et laudent in Filio tuo Jesu Christo, in quo Tibi laus et potentia in Sancta Ecclesia et nunc et semper et in secula seculorum. Amen. Ludolf. loc. cit. p. 325.

[2] Qui sumunt et accipiunt sanctum sacramentum corporis et sanguinis Christi. Id. ibid. p. 326.

[3] Sanctum mysterium. Ib. p. 326 and 327.

ment with the primitive Church forbids her striking out or altering, but which are practically nullified, both by the additions she has made, and by the dominant teaching of the Church.

For, in the first place, the prayer offered for the elements on their first oblation (which takes place previous to their consecration) is only this,—that the oblation "may be *made to us* the Body and Blood" of the Saviour.[1]

Now this prayer is not for an *absolute* but a *relative* change, and need not imply more than that change of *character, operation,* and *effect* by which the elements are made instruments for bringing the faithful communicant into communion with the real body and blood of Christ.

And in this sense the prayer was retained by Archbishop Cranmer in our first Reformed Book of Common Prayer, issued in 1549; though, to avoid all possibility of misconception in the matter, the phrase was wisely omitted in the first revision of the Book in 1552, and has never since been readmitted.

Archbishop Cranmer, speaking of these words as they occur in the Book of Common Prayer of 1549, says,—

"Christ is present whensoever the Church prayeth unto him, and is gathered together in his name. And the bread and wine be made unto us the Body and Blood of Christ, (as it is in the Book of Common Prayer,) but not by changing the substance of bread and wine into the substance of Christ's natural body and blood, but that *in the godly using of them they be unto the receivers Christ's Body and Blood;* as of some the Scripture saith, that their riches is their redemption, and to some it is their damnation; and as God's word to some is life, to some it is death and a snare, as the prophet saith. And Christ himself to some is a stone to stumble at, to some is a raising from death, not by conversion of substances, but by good or evil *use:* that thing which to the godly is salvation, to the ungodly is damnation. So is the water in baptism, and the bread and wine in the Lord's Supper, to the worthy receivers Christ himself and eternal life, and to the unworthy receivers everlasting death and damnation, not by conversion of one substance into

[1] Quam oblationem tu Deus in omnibus, quæsumus, benedictam, adscriptam, ratam, rationabilem, acceptabilemque facere digneris: ut nobis Corpus et Sanguis fiat dilectissimi Filii tui Domini nostri Jesu Christi: Qui pridie quam pateretur, &c.—I quote from the edition of the *Missale Romanum*, published Antwerp. 1691. fol.

another, but *by godly or ungodly use thereof.* And therefore in the Book of the Holy Communion we do not pray absolutely that the bread and wine may be made the Body and Blood of Christ, but that unto us in that holy mystery they may be so; that is to say, that we may so worthily receive the same, that we may be partakers of Christ's Body and Blood, and that therewith in spirit and in truth we may be spiritually nourished. And a like prayer of old time were all the people wont to make at the communion of all such offerings as at that time all the people used to offer, praying that their offerings might be unto them the Body and Blood of Christ." [1]

And again, in the same work further on, he says,—

"Therefore in the Book of the Holy Communion, we do not pray that the creatures of bread and wine may be the Body and Blood of Christ; but that they may be to us the Body and Blood of Christ; that is to say, that we may so eat them and drink them, that we may be partakers of his body crucified, and of his blood shed for our redemption." [2]

On the revision of the Prayer Book, however, it was rightly judged that the popular mind seldom reasons in this way, and might misinterpret the words; in consequence of which they were removed.

But in the earlier times of the Church, when the meaning of such language was generally understood, there was not the same objection to its use.

It must be added, also, that, in the form of the prayer of consecration given by the Author of the work "De Sacramentis," attributed to Ambrose, *instead* of these expressions, we find the following very different words:—"which is a figure of the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ." [3] This therefore was certainly the more antient form used in the Church at Milan, of which Ambrose was bishop, even if it was not used at Rome. But it appears from the form of the Ambrosian Liturgy given by Muratori as the most antient he could find,[4] that it was after-

[1] Cranmer's Answer to Gardiner. Works, P. S. ed. vol. i. p. 79. (ed. 1580. p. 79.)

[2] Id. ib. p. 271. (ed. 1580. p. 289.)

[3] Fac nobis hanc oblationem ascriptam, ratam, rationabilem, acceptabilem: quod figura est corporis et sanguinis Domini nostri Jesu Christi: Qui pridie quam pateretur, &c. Pseud-Ambros. De Sacram. lib. v. c. 5. Ambros. Op. ii. 371.

[4] Muratori Vetus Liturgia Rom. Venet. 1748. in dissert. de reb. liturg. tom. i. col. 131, 132. As Muratori professes to give the most antient form, it would have been fairer if he had noticed in a note the fact stated above.

wards altered at Milan. And thus here again we see how alterations were gradually made in these Liturgies, eliminating or obscuring the pure doctrine of the primitive Church, as originally existing in them.

Moreover, the prayers used after the consecration, with reference to God's acceptance of the consecrated substances, are inconsistent with the notion that they are, or contain, the real Body and Blood of Christ. For instance, the following,—

"Wherefore we thy servants, O Lord, and also thy holy people, mindful as well of the blessed Passion of the same Christ thy Son our Lord, as also of his resurrection from the dead, and further of his glorious ascension into heaven, offer to thy excellent Majesty *of thy own donations and gifts* a pure host, a holy host, an immaculate host, the holy *bread* of eternal life, and the *cup* of everlasting salvation. Upon which [offerings] vouchsafe to look with a favorable and serene countenance, and to give them acceptance, as thou didst vouchsafe to give acceptance to the offerings of thy child the righteous Abel and the sacrifice of our patriarch Abraham, and the holy sacrifice, the immaculate host, which thy high priest Melchizedech offered to thee."[1]

Now this prayer is quite inconsistent with the supposition that the consecrated substances have actually become the Body and Blood of Christ. For, after referring to our Lord's ascension, it proceeds to speak of the consecrated substances as God's gifts, and still as *bread* and *the cup*, though now after consecration they are justly styled "the holy bread of eternal life, and the cup of everlasting salvation." And it entreats God *to look upon them with favor, and accept them*, as he accepted the offerings of Abel, Abraham, and Melchizedech :—a prayer which, if they had become in any way the real body and blood of Christ, would be monstrous.

The prayer is evidently similar to the form in the Clementine

[1] Unde et memores, Domine, nos servi tui, sed et plebs tua sancta, ejusdem Christi Filii tui Domini nostri tam beatæ passionis, necnon et ab inferis resurrectionis, sed et in cœlos gloriosæ ascensionis: offerimus præclaræ Majestati tuæ de tuis donis ac datis, hostiam puram, hostiam sanctam, hostiam immaculatam, Panem sanctum vitæ æternæ, et Calicem salutis perpetuæ. Supra quæ propitio ac sereno vultu respicere digneris, et accepta habere: sicuti accepta habere dignatus es munera pueri tui justi Abel; et sacrificium patriarchæ nostri Abrahæ; et quod tibi obtulit summus sacerdos tuus Melchizedech, sanctum sacrificium, immaculatam hostiam.

Liturgy,—"We offer to thee this bread and this cup . . . and we beseech thee to look graciously upon these gifts set before thee," [1] &c.—which, in that Liturgy, is clearly a prayer for the acceptance of the bread and wine, inasmuch as it occurs previous to the prayer that the Holy Spirit would make the bread the body, and the wine the blood of Christ.

Again it is said of the consecrated substances,—

"By whom [i. e. Christ], O Lord, thou dost always create, sanctify, vivify, bless, and bestow upon us *all these good things*." [2]

But if they had become in any way the real body and blood of Christ, it is impossible that this language could have been used respecting them.

And when all have communicated, the priest is directed to say,—

"What we have taken with the mouth, O Lord, may we receive with a pure mind: and of a *temporal gift* may it be to us an everlasting remedy." [3]

But who would call the real Body and Blood of Christ "a temporal gift," and pray that "of a temporal gift" it might be made to us "an everlasting remedy?"

The Romish Service itself, then, when we come to examine it, is inconsistent with the notion of the elements becoming, after consecration, the real Body and Blood of Christ. The remains of antient doctrine in it, which could not be got rid of, refute the present doctrine of the Church of Rome.

## SECTION IV.

### Review of the statements of those Fathers who are chiefly relied upon by the Authors under review, for the support of their doctrine.

I now proceed to take a connected view of the statements of those Fathers on whom chiefly the Authors under review seem to rest for the Patristical evidence in favor of their doctrine.

To go through the whole of the writings of the Fathers that

[1] Προσφέρομέν σοι. . . . τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον, καὶ τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο, . . . . καὶ ἀξιοῦμέν σε, ὅπως εὐμενῶς ἐπιβλέψῃς ἐπὶ τὰ προκείμενα δῶρα ἐνώπιόν σου κ. τ. λ. Pseudo-Clement. Liturg. loc. cit. p. 407.

[2] Per quem hæc omnia, Domine, semper bona creas, sanctificas, vivificas, benedicis, et præstas nobis.

[3] Quod ore sumpsimus, Domine, pura mente capiamus: et de munere temporali fiat nobis remedium sempiternum.

remain to us, is neither necessary nor possible within any reasonable limits. No doubt it would be easy to do what Dr. Pusey has done with respect to them; that is, heap up a number of passages in which they speak in strong terms of the blessings of the Eucharist, and indiscriminately string them together without attempting to show the reader in what sense a general review of their statements shows that they used the terms in which they spoke of it.[1] But what purpose this would answer in the case of any who need information on the subject, except to mislead them, I cannot imagine.

My object will be, to point out, from a general review of the statements of the Author under consideration, so far as his works remaining to us permit of it, and the limits of this work allow, —connected with a recollection of the already-proved general doctrine of the Fathers,—what is the meaning of the passages adduced from his writings by the Authors under review in support of their doctrine. And having done this in the case of those chiefly relied upon, all will have been accomplished that seems necessary for our purpose. The principles of interpretation established in their case will amply meet the passages adduced from other Fathers, except where (as Archdeacon Wilberforce is compelled to admit is the case with Anastatius Sinaita)[2] they may have used language clearly unorthodox, and involving the Capernaite error.

I begin with—

### Ignatius. (fl. a. 101.)

The following passage is quoted from his writings by Archdeacon Wilberforce[3] and Dr. Pusey.[4]

[1] Pusey's Doctr. of Real Presence vindicated in Notes, &c., Note S, pp. 315—722.

[2] Wilb. Doctr. of Euch. pp. 125, 126, or, 3rd ed. pp. 106, 107.

[3] I must here notice another proof of the way in which Archdeacon Wilberforce has got his extracts from the Fathers, and which shows how little weight can be attached to his work as giving an independent judgment as to the testimony of the Fathers from an acquaintance with their works. He quotes the passage thus :—

"The Docetæ abstain from the Eucharist," says St. Ignatius, "because they do not confess it to be the Flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ, which suffered for our sins, which the Father raised up through his mercy." Ad Smyrnæos, 6.

Now the original says nothing about the Docetæ. It is only a conjecture that Ignatius meant them. And other words are omitted. The passage, like many others in his book, shows on the face of it that the original was not even consulted.

[4] Wilb. on Euch. p. 92, 324, 336. or 3rd. ed. p. 78, 278, 289. Pusey (ut supra cit.) p. 317.

"They [i. e. certain heretics of whom he had been speaking] abstain from the Eucharist and Prayer [i. e. probably public congregational Prayer], because they do not confess that the Eucharist is the flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ, which suffered for our sins, and which the Father, in his goodness, raised from the grave." [1]

This passage is not found in most of the Greek MSS. of this Epistle, but it occurs in the Medicean MS., and also is recognized in an antient Latin version of the Epistle first published by Archbishop Usher, and is quoted, with a slight difference in the reading, by Theodoret,[2] as occurring in Ignatius's Epistle to the Smyrnæans.

I am not disposed to question its genuineness, though, from the above-mentioned discrepancy in the MSS., and from the evidence afforded from the Syriac translation of other Epistles of Ignatius, as recently published by Mr. Cureton, of the manner in which the Epistles of Ignatius, as extant in Greek, have been interpolated, it is clearly not free from suspicion.

So far, however, as relates to our present subject, the passage presents no difficulty. It refers to certain heretics (probably the Docetæ) who did not confess that our Lord had come in the flesh, but denied the reality of our Lord's human nature, and consequently the reality of his passion and resurrection.[3] In this sense it is quoted by Theodoret in the passage just referred to. These heretics, therefore, of course, could not make use of the Eucharist, where the bread and wine are received as *being, representatively,* the flesh and blood of Christ; inasmuch as they did not believe that Christ *had* any *real* flesh and blood.

That such is the sense of the passage is clear from two considerations; *first,* that all agree that the bread does not become real flesh; and *secondly,* that if the doctrine of the Church had been, that the presence was the presence of the body in an incorporeal and spiritual form, these heretics would have had little or no difficulty in the matter, for they held that the body in

[1] Εὐχαριστίας καὶ προσευχῆς ἀπέχονται, διὰ τὸ μὴ ὁμολογεῖν τὴν εὐχαριστίαν σάρκα εἶναι τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τὴν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν παθοῦσαν, ἣν τῇ χρηστότητι ὁ Πατὴρ ἤγειρεν. IGNAT. Epist. ad Smyrn. § 6. Inter Patr. Apostol. ed. Jacobson. Oxon. 1838. tom. ii. p. 412.

[2] THEODORET. Dialog iii. *voc.* Impatibilis. Op. ed. cit. iv. 231, where the reading is, Εὐχαριστίας καὶ προσφορὰς οὐκ ἀποδέχονται, διὰ τὸ, κ. τ. λ.

[3] See BISHOP PEARSON'S Vindiciæ Ignat. pt. 2. c. 11. *init.*

which our Lord appeared on earth was of this kind, that is, that though it seemed to be a body, it had no material substance; which is precisely the body (if body it can be called) supposed by the Authors under review to be present in or under the consecrated bread. Their difficulty arose from the fact that the bread in the Eucharist was taken as being, representatively, that which they did not acknowledge our Blessed Lord to have had. If our Lord had no real body, the bread could not be a figure of that which had no existence. As Tertullian says to Marcion, who revived the same heresy,—Christ "made the bread that "he took and distributed to his disciples his own body, by "saying, 'This is my body,' that is, a figure of my body. But "it would not have been a figure, unless there had been a "real body. Moreover, an airy thing, such as a phantasm is, "would not admit of a figure." [1]

And Bellarmine admits, that the reason why they denied that the Eucharist was the flesh of the Lord was because they denied that our Lord had flesh.[2]

The reader will of course recollect, as confirmatory of the preceding remarks, the numerous proofs given in the second section of this chapter, that the Fathers spoke of the bread and wine as *being* the body and blood of Christ in the sense of their being so figuratively and symbolically.

The following passage is also quoted by the Archdeacon and Dr. Pusey, from the Epistle of Ignatius to the Ephesians, § 20.[3] I give it in Dr. Pusey's own words:—

"Breaking one bread, which is the medicine of immortality, the antidote that we should not die, but live in Jesus Christ for ever."

But how this can favor their views, I am at a loss to imagine. For if we take the words in their *primâ facie* sense, all who eat that bread will have eternal life; which they themselves

[1] Acceptum panem et distributum discipulis, corpus illum suum fecit, 'hoc est corpus meum' dicendo, id est, figura corporis mei. Figura autem non fuisset, nisi veritatis esset corpus. Ceterum, vacua res, quod est phantasma, figuram capere non posset. TERTULL. Adv. Marc. iv. 40. Op. ed. cit. pp. 457, 458.

[2] Non tam sacramentum Eucharistiæ, quam mysterium Incarnationis oppugnasse. Idcirco enim (ut Ignatius ibidem indicat) negabant Eucharistiam esse carnem Domini, quia negabant Dominum habere carnem. BELLARM. De Euch. lib. i. c. i. Op. tom. iii. col. 387.

[3] WILB. p. 102 and 197. 3rd ed. p. 87 and 168. PUSEY, p. 318.

deny. But that the *bread* may be partaken of in a way which will make it what it is here called, I am far from denying.

And this answer suffices for a host of passages brought by Dr. Pusey from other Fathers, speaking of the Eucharist in similar terms. Such phrases may be truthfully used with reference to it, when it is partaken of in a right spirit.

As to the other passage quoted from Ignatius by Dr. Pusey,[1] which I give below,[2] I must leave it to Dr. Pusey to show how it testifies in favor of his doctrine, and I shall then be ready to deal with it.

I proceed to—

JUSTIN MARTYR, (fl. a. 140.)

whose testimony in the following passage, descriptive of the nature of the Eucharistic rite, is urged in favor of the doctrine here controverted.[3]

"Then there is brought to the president of the brethren[4] bread and a cup of water and wine mingled with the water, and he having taken them offers up praise and glory to the Father of the Universe through the name of the Son and Holy Spirit, and utters a long thanksgiving that we have been considered worthy of these things by him; and he having concluded the prayers and thanksgiving, all the people present signify their assent, saying, Amen. But Amen in the Hebrew language signifies, May it be so. But the president having given thanks, and all the people having signified their assent, those called by us deacons give to each of those present of *the bread* and *wine and water* over which thanks have been given,[5] for them to partake of, and carry away to those not present. And this food[6] is called by us the Eucharist; of which no one else may partake but one who believes that the things taught by us are true, and who has been washed in the laver that is for the remission of sins and unto regeneration, and is so living as Christ commanded. For we do not receive these things as *common bread* nor as *common drink*, but in the same manner as Jesus Christ our Saviour being made flesh

[1] PUSEY, p. 317.

[2] "Haste ye then to partake of one Eucharist. For there is one Flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, and one Cup for the uniting of his Blood, one Altar." Ep. ad Philad. n. 4.

[3] WILB. pp. 92, 273, 324. 3rd ed. pp. 87, 234, 278. PUSEY, pp. 318—320.

[4] Τῷ προεστῶτι τῶν ἀδελφῶν.

[5] Τοῦ ἐυχαριστηθέντος ἄρτου καὶ οἴνου καὶ ὕδατος. [6] Ἡ τροφὴ αὕτη.

through the Word of God had both flesh and blood for the sake of our salvation; so also we have been taught, that that food over which thanks have been given in prayer containing the words that he uttered, by which [food] our blood and flesh are by conversion nourished, are both the flesh and blood of that incarnate Jesus.[1] For the Apostles, in the Narratives written by them, which are called Gospels, have thus reported that it was enjoined on them; that Jesus having taken bread, gave thanks and said, 'Do this in remembrance of me, this is my body;' and in like manner, having taken the cup and given thanks, said, 'This is my blood;' and communicated these things to them alone." [2]

The sentence relied upon by those who hold the view here controverted, is of course the last but one; but I have given the context as illustrative of the real meaning of Justin. The passage is, no doubt, an obscure one; and such it is admitted to be by all the commentators upon it. But nevertheless there is distinct evidence in it, that Justin considered the elements to remain bread and wine, and to fulfil their usual purpose when received into the body. For, in the first place, speaking of the *consecrated* elements, he says, that the deacons distribute the *bread*, and *wine and water*, to those present and carry them to those absent; and that we do not, after consecration, receive them as "common *bread*" and "common drink." The *bread*, therefore, is still *bread*, though it is not *common bread*, being now set apart for a sacred purpose. Just as we have seen that the Fathers tell us, that we are not to regard the water consecrated for baptismal purposes as *common* water.[3] And he says, that by this food "our flesh and blood are, by conversion, nourished." Now no one supposes that our flesh and blood are nourished by the flesh and blood of Christ becoming of the substance of our flesh and blood by conversion. This is only true of the bread and wine. And therefore, in whatever way Justin considered

[1] Οὐ γὰρ ὡς κοινὸν ἄρτον οὐδὲ κοινὸν πόμα ταῦτα λαμβάνομεν· ἀλλ' ὃν τρόπον διὰ λόγου Θεοῦ σαρκοποιηθεὶς Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ὁ σωτὴρ ἡμῶν καὶ σάρκα καὶ αἷμα ὑπὲρ σωτηρίας ἡμῶν ἔσχεν, οὕτως καὶ τὴν δι' εὐχῆς λόγου τοῦ παρ' αὐτοῦ εὐχαριστηθεῖσαν τροφήν, ἐξ ἧς αἷμα καὶ σάρκες κατὰ μεταβολὴν τρέφονται ἡμῶν, ἐκείνου τοῦ σαρκοποιηθέντος Ἰησοῦ καὶ σάρκα καὶ αἷμα ἐδιδάχθημεν εἶναι.

[2] Justin. Mart. Apol. prim. §§ 65, 66. Op. ed. Otto. Jenæ, 1847. tom. i. pt. 1. pp. 154, 156.

[3] See pp. 398—407 above.

that the bread and wine became the flesh and blood of Christ, it was certainly not in any way that unfitted them for giving nourishment in the ordinary way, and therefore not by their substance being taken away or changed for anything which does not give nourishment by being converted into our flesh and blood, and therefore not by Transubstantiation.

And against the doctrine of Consubstantiation it is sufficient to observe, that it is *the food which thus nourishes*—not, something joined to that food—which is the flesh and blood of Christ.

In what way, then, can it be so, but in *character, operation,* and *effect?* And symbolical language upon such subjects was so common among the heathen, that the Emperor, to whom this Apology for the Christians was addressed, would certainly have no difficulty in understanding the words in that sense.

And it should be borne in mind, that Justin, in the same work, tells the Emperor, that Christ had ascended to heaven, and that there are only two advents of Christ;[1] one, that which took place when he appeared on earth as a dishonoured and suffering man, and the other, when he shall come from heaven with glory attended by his heavenly host.[2]

But if the presence of his body is vouchsafed in the Eucharist whenever celebrated, though invisibly and in a spiritual form, he could not consistently have used such language.

It has been suggested by Romish writers, that these words may be considered as referring to the bread and wine as they existed previous to consecration, or that they may be understood as referring to the effect produced upon our bodies by the reception of the Body and Blood of Christ in preparing them for a glorious resurrection and eternal life. But neither of these interpretations is admissible. The food spoken of is clearly the food as it exists *after* consecration, and the effect is as clearly that effect which is produced by ordinary food.[3]

And in his "Dialogue with Trypho" there occur various passages in which the bread and wine of the Eucharist are distinctly

[1] Δύο γὰρ αὐτοῦ παρουσίας προεκήρυξαν οἱ προφῆται.

[2] Id. ib. § 52. p. 120.

[3] The reader will find a more full vindication of the proper meaning of the passage from the interpretation given to it by the Romanists in Albertinus, De Euchar. pp. 291—296.

spoken of as memorials of the crucified Body and Blood of Christ.

Thus he speaks of "the bread of the Eucharist, which Jesus "Christ our Lord commanded us to constitute as a memorial of "the suffering which he endured for the sake of cleansing the "souls of men from all iniquity."[1]

Again, commenting on a passage in the prophet Isaiah, he says, that he speaks—

"Concerning the bread which our Christ ordered us to constitute as a memorial of his assuming a body on account of those that believe on him, on account of whom also he became subject to suffering, and concerning the cup which he ordered us to constitute with thanksgiving as a memorial of his blood."[2]

And more especially in the following passage:—

"I also say, that prayers and thanksgivings, that proceed from the righteous, are the only perfect and acceptable sacrifices to God. For these alone also have Christians been taught to make, both for a memorial of their food, both dry and liquid, and in which also a memorial is made of the suffering which the Son of God suffered on their account."[3]

Now, these expressions are quite inconsistent with the notion that the bread and wine become the real body and blood of Christ. In that case they are not made *memorials*, but *realities;* they are *the things themselves*, instead of *memorials* of them. And this is so clear, that I really do not think it necessary to distract the reader's attention from this plain fact by adding answers to all the vain cavils of the Romanists on the subject; a refutation of which may be seen in Albertinus;[4] especially after all

[1] Καὶ ἡ τῆς σεμιδάλεως δὲ προσφορά, . . . τύπος ἦν τοῦ ἄρτου τῆς εὐχαριστίας, ὃν εἰς ἀνάμνησιν τοῦ πάθους, οὗ ἔπαθεν ὑπὲρ τῶν καθαιρομένων τὰς ψυχὰς ἀπὸ πάσης πονηρίας ἀνθρώπων, Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν παρέδωκε ποιεῖν. Id. Dial. cum Tryph. § 41. Tom. i. pt. 2. p. 134.

[2] Περὶ τοῦ ἄρτου, ὃν παρέδωκεν ἡμῖν ὁ ἡμέτερος Χριστὸς ποιεῖν εἰς ἀνάμνησιν τοῦ τε σωματοποιήσασθαι αὐτὸν διὰ τοὺς πίστεύοντας εἰς αὐτόν, δι' οὓς καὶ παθητὸς γέγονε, καὶ περὶ τοῦ ποτηρίου, ὃ εἰς ἀνάμνησιν τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ παρέδωκεν εὐχαριστοῦντας ποιεῖν. Id. ib. § 70. p. 244.

[3] Ὅτι μὲν οὖν καὶ εὐχαι καὶ εὐχαριστίαι, ὑπὸ τῶν ἀξίων γινόμεναι, τέλειαι μόναι καὶ εὐάρεστοί εἰσι τῷ Θεῷ θυσίαι, καὶ αὐτός φημι. Ταῦτα γὰρ μόνα καὶ Χριστιανοὶ παρέλαβον ποιεῖν, καὶ ἐπ' ἀναμνήσει δὲ τῆς τροφῆς αὐτῶν ξηρᾶς τε καὶ ὑγρᾶς, ἐν ᾗ καὶ τοῦ πάθους, ὃ πέπονθε δι' αὐτοὺς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, μέμνηται. Id. ib. §. 117. p. 394.

[4] Loc. cit.

the proofs adduced, in the second Section of this Chapter, of the doctrine of the Fathers on this subject.

Lastly, Dr. Pusey admits, that it appears from another passage of Justin Martyr,[1] that he believed that when our Lord spoke of "the fruit of the vine," he meant real wine.[2] He believed, therefore, that what was in the cup after consecration, and was received by the Apostles, was real wine.

The next Father whose statements I shall notice is—

### Irenæus. (fl. a. 167.)

There are two passages in his works which are quoted by Archdeacon Wilberforce, and are the only important ones of those cited by Dr. Pusey,[3] as maintaining the doctrine of a real substantial bodily presence in or with or under the form of the consecrated elements.

I shall give them at length, with their context.

The first — in which he is speaking of some heretics that denied that bread and wine are the creatures of God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ—is as follows :—

"But how shall it appear to them, that that bread over which thanks are given is the body of their Lord and the cup of his blood [*We must read, I conceive,*—and the cup his blood], if they do not admit that he is the Son of the Creator of the world, that is, his Word, by which the tree is fruitful, and the fountains flow, and the earth yields first the blade, then the ear, then the full corn in the ear? But how again do they say that our flesh goes to corruption, and does not partake of life, which is nourished with the body and blood of the Lord? Therefore let them either change their opinion, or abstain from offering the afore-mentioned things. But our opinion agrees with the Eucharist; and the Eucharist, on the other hand, confirms our opinion. For we offer to him the things which are his, suitably showing forth the communion and union of the flesh and spirit. For as the bread which is from the earth, receiving the invocation of God, is now no longer common bread, but the Eucharist, consisting of two things, earthly and heavenly, so also our bodies receiving the Eucharist are now no longer corruptible [*i. e.* to be finally destroyed by corruption], having the hope of

[1] Dial. cum Tryph. § 51. [2] Pusey, pp. 318 and 135, 136.
[3] Wilb. pp. 102, 118, and 273, 274; or, 3d. ed. pp. 87, 100, and 234. Pusey, pp. 320—325.

resurrection. For we offer to him, not as to one who is in want, but giving thanks for his power [*or, as others read,* his gift] and sanctifying the creature." [1]

The other passage is this:—

"But they are altogether foolish who despise the whole arrangement of God, and deny the salvation of the flesh, and despise its regeneration, saying that it is not capable of incorruption. But if the flesh cannot be saved, then truly neither has the Lord re-

[1] Quomodo autem constabit eis, eum panem in quo gratiæ actæ sint, corpus esse Domini sui et calicem sanguinis [sanguinem *is probably the true reading*] ejus, si non ipsum Fabricatoris mundi Filium dicant, id est, Verbum ejus, per quod lignum fructificat, et defluunt fontes, et terra dat primum quidem fenum, post deinde spicam, deinde plenum triticum in spica? Quomodo autem rursus dicunt carnem in corruptionem devenire, et non percipere vitam, quæ corpore Domini et sanguine alitur? Ergo aut sententiam mutent, aut abstineant offerendo quæ prædicta sunt. Nostra autem consonans est sententia eucharistiæ, et eucharistia rursus confirmat sententiam nostram. Offerimus enim ei quæ sunt ejus, congruenter communicationem et unitatem prædicantes carnis et Spiritus. Quemadmodum enim qui est a terra panis, percipiens invocationem Dei, jam non communis panis est, sed eucharistia, ex duabus rebus constans, terrena et cœlesti; sic et corpora nostra percipientia eucharistiam, jam non sunt corruptibilia, spem resurrectionis habentia. Offerimus enim ei, non quasi indigenti, sed gratias agentes dominationi [*some MSS. read* donationi] ejus et sanctificantes creaturam. IREN. Adv. hæres. lib. iv. c. 18. §§ 4—6. ed. Mass. p. 251: ed. Stieren. Lip. 1853. tom. i. pp. 617—619: ed. Grab. c. 34. pp. 327, 328. Peter Halloix, in his Life of Irenæus, has given from a MS. of the "Parallela" of John Damascen, a portion of the above passage as there quoted by John Damascen professedly from the original Greek as follows:—*Πῶς . . . τὴν σάρκα λέγουσιν εἰς φθορὰν χωρεῖν, καὶ μὴ μετέχειν τῆς ζωῆς, τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Κυρίου, καὶ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ τρεφομένην; Ἢ τὴν γνώμην ἀλλαξάτωσαν, ἢ τὸ προσφέρειν τὰ εἰρημένα παραιτείσθωσαν. Ἡμῶν δὲ σύμφωνος ἡ γνώμη τῇ εὐχαριστίᾳ, καὶ ἡ εὐχαριστία . . . βεβαιοῖ τὴν γνώμην. . . . . Προσφέρομεν δὲ αὐτῷ τὰ ἴδια, ἐμμελῶς κοινωνίαν καὶ ἕνωσιν ἀπαγγέλλοντες, καὶ ὁμολογοῦντες σαρκὸς καὶ πνεύματος ἔγερσιν. Ὡς γὰρ ἀπὸ γῆς ἄρτος προσλαμβανόμενος τὴν ἔκκλησιν τοῦ Θεοῦ, οὐκέτι κοινὸς ἄρτος ἐστίν, ἀλλ' εὐχαριστία, ἐκ δύο πραγμάτων συνεστηκυῖα, ἐπιγείου τε καὶ οὐρανίου, οὕτως καὶ τὰ σώματα ἡμῶν μεταλαμβάνοντα τῆς εὐχαριστίας, μηκέτι εἶναι φθαρτά, τὴν ἐλπίδα τῆς εἰς αἰῶνας ἀναστάσεως ἔχοντα.* See all the above-mentioned editions, *loc. cit.*

It will be observed, that there are some differences in the Greek, as here given, from the old Latin version, and that there is nothing in the Latin version corresponding to the words *καὶ ὁμολογοῦντες . . . ἔγερσιν*, which also almost destroy the sense of the sentence, and are therefore rejected by Grabe as not genuine. There can be no doubt, I conceive, that the antient Latin version, which is evidently of the most carefully literal kind, is a better authority than a quotation made by John Damascen at a later period, for a particular purpose. And this is the view taken by the learned Editor of the valuable recent edition of Irenæus, Stieren. (loc. cit. p. 618. *note*) I have therefore followed, in the text, the old Latin version.

deemed us by his blood; nor is the cup of the Eucharist the communion of his blood, nor is the bread which we break the communion of his body. For blood is only from the veins and flesh and the rest of the substance which constitutes man, of which the Word of God was truly made.[1] He redeemed us by his blood, as also his Apostle says, 'In whom we have redemption, through his blood, the remission of sins.' And since we are his members, we are also nourished through the creature; but he himself supplies us with the creature, making his sun to rise, and giving rain, as he wills; that *cup*, which is a creature, *his blood*, which was poured forth, [*or, as the true reading probably is*, he declared to be his blood,] *from which he increases our blood;* and that *bread*, which is from the creature, he affirmed to be *his own body, from which he increases our bodies.* When, therefore, the mingled cup and the formed bread receive the word of God, and become the eucharist of the blood and body of Christ, *of which the substance of our flesh is increased and consists*, how do they deny that the flesh is capable of the gift of God, which is eternal life, which [flesh] is nourished by the blood and body of Christ, and is his member? As also the blessed Apostle says in his Epistle to the Ephesians, 'Since we are members of his body, of his flesh and of his bones;' not saying this of any spiritual and invisible man; 'for a spirit hath not bones nor flesh;' but of that constitution of body which characterizes a true and real man, which consists of flesh and nerves and bones: *which is nourished from the cup which is his blood, and is increased from the bread which is his body.* And just as the wood of the vine deposited in the earth bears fruit in its own time, and a grain of wheat falling into the earth and there being dissolved rises with a manifold increase through the Spirit of God that maintains all things; and these things afterwards, through wisdom, come to the use of man, and, receiving the word of God, become the Eucharist, which is the body and blood of Christ: thus also our bodies, nourished from it, [i. e., the Eucharist,] and laid in the earth, and there dissolved, shall rise again in their proper time, the Word of God granting them resurrection, to the glory of God the Father, who clothes this mortal with immortality, and graciously gives to that which is corruptible incorruption, since the power of God is made perfect in weakness."[2]

[1] Irenæus is here controverting the notions of those who supposed that our Lord's human nature was not real but only an appearance.

[2] Vani autem omnimodo, qui universam dispositionem Dei contemnunt, et carnis salutem negant et regenerationem ejus spernunt, dicentes non eam capacem esse incorruptibilitatis. Si autem non salvetur hæc, videlicet nec Dominus

To these passages I add, before I commence my remarks on them, that in which he notices with praise the answer of the Martyr Blandina to those who questioned her respecting the statement of the slaves who, "hearing that the divine com-munion was the blood and body of Christ, and thinking that "it was *in reality* blood and flesh, gave this answer to those "who inquired of them."[1] Blandina, says Irenæus, "wisely "replied with confidence, asking, how they who even abstained

sanguine suo redemit nos; neque calix eucharistiæ communicatio sanguinis ejus est, neque panis quem frangimus, communicatio corporis ejus est. Sanguis enim non est, nisi a venis et carnibus et a reliqua, quæ est secundum hominem, substantia, qua vere factum est Verbum Dei. Sanguine suo redemit nos, quemadmodum et Apostolus ejus ait: 'In quo habemus redemtionem, per sanguinem ejus, remissionem peccatorum.' Et quoniam membra ejus sumus, et per creaturam nutrimur; creaturam autem ipse nobis præstat, solem suum oriri faciens, et pluens, quemadmodum vult; eum calicem, qui est creatura, suum sanguinem qui effusus est, [*probably error of scribe for*, confessus est,] ex quo auget nostrum sanguinem; et eum panem, qui est a creatura, suum corpus confirmavit, ex quo nostra auget corpora. Quando ergo et mixtus calix et factus panis percipit verbum Dei, et fit eucharistia sanguinis et corporis Christi, [the Greek, as given in the MS. of John Damascen, has, *καὶ γίνεται ἡ εὐχαριστία σῶμα Χριστοῦ*] ex quibus augetur et consistit carnis nostræ substantia [*ἐκ τούτων δὲ αὔξει καὶ συνίσταται ἡ τῆς σαρκὸς ἡμῶν ὑπόστασις*]; quomodo carnem negant capacem esse donationis Dei, quæ est vita æterna, quæ sanguine et corpore Christi nutritur, et membrum ejus est? Quemadmodum et beatus Apostolus ait in ea quæ est ad Ephesios Epistola: 'Quoniam membra sumus corporis ejus, de carne ejus et de ossibus ejus;' non de spiritali aliquo et invisibili homine dicens hæc; 'Spiritus enim neque ossa neque carnes habet;' sed de ea dispositione, quæ est secundum verum hominem, quæ ex carnibus et nervis et ossibus consistit: quæ de calice, qui est sanguis ejus, nutritur, et de pane, quod est corpus ejus, augetur. Et quemadmodum lignum vitis depositum in terram suo fructificat tempore, et granum tritici decidens in terram et dissolutum multiplex surgit per Spiritum Dei, qui continet omnia; quæ deinde per sapientiam in usum hominis veniunt, et percipientia verbum Dei eucharistia fiunt, quod est corpus et sanguis Christi: [*εὐχαριστία γίνεται, ὅπερ ἐστὶ σῶμα καὶ αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ·*] sic et nostra corpora ex ea nutrita et reposita in terram et resoluta in ea resurgent in suo tempore, Verbo Dei resurrectionem eis donante, in gloriam Dei Patris, qui huic mortali immortalitatem circumdat, [*περιποιεῖ,*] et corruptibili incorruptelam gratuito donat, quoniam virtus Dei in infirmitate perficitur. Id. ib. lib. v. c. 2. §§ 2, 3. ed. Mass. pp. 293, 294. ed. Stieren. tom. i. pp. 717—719. ed Grab. pp. 395—400.

A portion of this passage has also been given in Greek by Halloix, from the same MS. as that from which the passage in the preceding note was cited; and I have noticed above those parts of it in which there is any difference of importance from the old Latin version, or where it confirms an important point in the passage. But I must add here what was said in the last note, that where it differs from the old Latin version, the *latter* is clearly the best authority.

[1] *Τὴν θείαν μετάληψιν αἷμα καὶ σῶμα εἶναι Χριστοῦ, αὐτοὶ νομίσαντες τῷ ὄντι αἷμα καὶ σάρκα εἶναι, τοῦτο ἐξεῖπον τοῖς ἐκζητοῦσιν.*

" from permitted meats on account of their rules of discipline, " could endure such things." [1]

Now, putting these passages together, I observe first, that the last shows us, that when Irenæus spoke of the Eucharist as being the flesh and blood of Christ, he did *not* mean that it was " *in reality* blood and flesh." Whether it does not follow, that he believed that it was only *symbolically* so, might, I think, be safely left to the judgment of any impartial reader. But, as the Romanists and the Authors under review imagine a *real* presence of *natural* flesh and blood in a *spiritual* and *immaterial* form, irrational as such a notion may be, I proceed to notice other inferences deducible from the passages before us, illustrative of the doctrine held by Irenæus.

The next observation, therefore, which I would make upon these passages is, that, according to them, it is *the bread itself* that is the *body* of Christ, and *the wine itself* that is the *blood* of Christ; *not* anything joined to the bread and wine. And the reader will recollect, that in a former part of this chapter I have pointed out other passages of Irenæus in which the same doctrine is maintained. [2] Consequently they are clearly opposed to the doctrine of the Authors under review. And Dr. Pusey admits, that Irenæus, as well as Justin Martyr, considered what our Lord called " the fruit of the vine," and which was what was contained in the cup after consecration, to be real wine. [3]

Moreover, it is repeatedly stated in these passages, that by that which is called the Body and Blood of Christ *the substance of our bodies is increased;* while all agree, that it would be heretical to suppose, that in the Eucharist the substance of our bodies is increased by the real body and blood of Christ. It follows, therefore, that they are natural substances, suitable to give nourishment to our bodies, which are *called* the Body and Blood of Christ.

These conclusions I hold to be undeniable by any unprejudiced mind. And they are sufficient, whatever interpretation

[1] Οἷς εὐστόχως Βλανδῖνα ἐπαῤῥησιάσατο, πῶς ἄν, εἰποῦσα, τούτων ἀνάσχοιντο οἱ μηδὲ τῶν ἐφειμένων κρεῶν δι' ἄσκησιν ἀπολαύοντες. IREN. Fragm. xiii. ab Œcum. Comment. in 1 Pet. iii. Op. ed. Mass. p. 343. ed. Stieren. i. 832. ed. Grab. p. 469. It is quoted by Dr. Pusey, pp. 324, 325.

[2] See p. 237 above.

[3] PUSEY, Notes, &c., pp. 321 and 136. He refers to Iren. Adv. Hæres. v. 33. 1.

may be given to these passages in other respects, for our purpose.

But, strangely enough, these very expressions of the flesh being fed and nourished with the Body of Christ are put forward by Archdeacon Wilberforce as evidence of the truth of his doctrine. Does he suppose, then, that the flesh of Christ is so swallowed by the mouth as to act thus upon our body? He himself tells us that he does not; and that he holds that the body is only affected through the soul, and that the soul receives the body of Christ only by an act of faith. How then do these passages prove the reception of the body of Christ by the mouth?

But there is one more point to be considered in these passages.

The sense in which the phrase "body and blood of Christ" is here used having been determined, the only remaining difficulty (and in fact the only difficulty in the passage) is, what we are to understand by the words, that the bread becomes "the Eucharist, consisting of two things, earthly and heavenly." What then does Irenæus mean by *the heavenly thing?* It cannot be the heavenly body of Christ, because (not to mention that it is the crucified not the glorified body of Christ that we are called to partake of in the Eucharist) he himself tells us, that that body of Christ that is present in the Eucharist *increases the substance of our bodies when we partake of it*, and no one supposes that Christ's real body is present so as to effect this. In what sense, then, are we to understand these words?

Here again, as it appears to me, our best guide is the language of the Fathers respecting the water of Baptism. They use precisely the same terms with reference to the water consecrated for baptism.

They tell us, as has been already shown,[1] that the water after consecration is no longer simple water, but water to which a divine power has been conjoined; that "by the powerful work-"ing of the Spirit the sensible water is transelemented into a "certain Divine and unspeakable power, and thenceforth sanctifies "those to whom it may be applied;"[2] that it is called "living

[1] See pp. 398 et seq. above.

[2] See pp. 398, 399 above.

water," (which, in other words, is saying that it consists of two things, an earthly and a heavenly) "because by that water Divine grace gives eternal life;"[1] that it "receives power [or, virtue] on the invocation of the Holy Spirit and Christ," "for since the nature of man is twofold, consisting of body and soul, the purification is also twofold: that which is immaterial is cleansed by that which is immaterial, that which is bodily by that which is bodily;"[2]—which again represents the water itself as possessing an earthly and a heavenly quality; while no one supposes that it is meant that the water and the Divine grace or power alluded to form one compound whole;—also, that "when it *receives the grace of the Spirit*, then it washes away all sins;"[3]—and, that it is "full of the sanctification of the Spirit and of Divine fire,"[4]—which again attributes to it a twofold nature, an earthly and a heavenly.

Now, no one supposes that the Fathers used these expressions to signify, that any real change had passed upon the water, or that anything had been so joined with or infused into the water, that the two had become one compound whole, so that if any one drank the water, he would drink with it "the Spirit" or "Divine fire." The meaning of these expressions is obvious; namely, that there was a heavenly power accompanying the *use* of the water in suitable cases; while, nevertheless, in their *literal* sense they are open to just the same construction as that which has been given to similar expressions when applied to the Eucharistic elements.

As to *the effects* which Irenæus here attributes to the reception of the Eucharist, the doctrine that the consecrated elements are only symbolically the Body and Blood of Christ does not at all affect that point, because, though, in themselves, only symbolical and representative, they bring the believer into true union and communion with the body and blood of Christ, and are *effectual*, by Divine institution and promise, for all the ends proposed to be answered by the rite.

And there is a passage in a fragment of Irenæus published by Pfaff, which seems to me to decide the question as to what he considered the consecrated substances in the Eucharist to be. He says:—

[1] See p. 399 above.
[2] See p. 400 above.
[3] See p. 403 above.
[4] See p. 406 above.

"The oblation of the Eucharist is not carnal but spiritual, and in this respect pure. For we offer to God the bread and the cup of blessing, giving thanks over it, that He hath commanded the earth to bring forth these fruits for our food, and then having completed the oblation we invoke the Holy Spirit that He may cause this sacrifice to exhibit, the bread the body of Christ, and the cup the blood of Christ, that those who partake of THESE ANTITYPES may obtain remission of sins and life everlasting." [1]

Therefore *the consecrated substances,* the things which the communicants receive, are ANTITYPES of the body and blood of Christ. [2] Surely this is plain language. And how is the argument met? We are told that when the consecrated substances are called *antitypes* or *symbols,* &c., we must understand, that the consecrated substances consist of two things, and that *one* of them is an *antitype,* or *symbol* of the other; so that though they are called *antitypes,* they are in fact antitypes and their realities joined together. I can only say, *Qui vult decipi, decipiatur.*

Three other passages are quoted by Dr. Pusey. Two of them are cited apparently on account of their containing the statement, that the Lord called the bread his body and the wine his blood; which appears to me to lead to precisely the contrary conclusion to that which is drawn from it by Dr. Pusey; and I have already quoted those passages in a former page [3] in that view.

From the third it appears to me impossible to raise any valid argument on the point at issue; but the reader who desires to consider it, will find it in bk. v. c. 1. § 3.

[1] Διότι καὶ ἡ προσφορὰ τῆς εὐχαριστίας οὐκ ἔστι σαρκική, ἀλλὰ πνευματικὴ καὶ ἐν τούτῳ καθαρά. Προσφέρομεν γὰρ τῷ Θεῷ τὸν ἄρτον καὶ τὸ ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας εὐχαριστοῦντες αὐτῷ, ὅτι τῇ γῇ ἐκέλευσε[ν] ἐκφύσαι τοὺς καρποὺς τούτους εἰς τροφὴν ἡμετέραν, καὶ ἐνταῦθα τὴν προσφορὰν τελέσαντες ἐκκαλοῦμεν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, ὅπως ἀποφήνῃ τὴν θυσίαν ταύτην καὶ τὸν ἄρτον σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ τὸ ποτήριον τὸ αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἵνα οἱ μεταλαβόντες τούτων τῶν ἀντιτύπων, τῆς ἀφέσεως τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν καὶ τῆς ζωῆς αἰωνίου τύχωσιν. IREN. fragm. in Pfaffii Fragm. Anecd. S. Irenæi. Hag. Com. 1715. pp. 26, 27, or in Iren. Op. ed. Steiren. tom. i. pp. 854, 855.

[2] This passage may be added to those in the tenth head of the 2nd Section of this chapter.

[3] See p. 237 above.

## Cyril of Jerusalem. (fl. a. 350.)

I pass next to Cyril of Jerusalem, to whom are ascribed, among other works, five Mystagogical Lectures, addressed to those who have just been baptized, from which Dr. Pusey and Archdeacon Wilberforce, like the Romanists, cite various passages in support of their doctrine. There are too many reasons, however, for doubting the genuineness of these Lectures, at least in their present state, to admit of Cyril's authority being alleged for their statements. Among those who deny that they are Cyril's is our own learned Bishop Andrews.[1] And it cannot be denied, that in one at least of the MSS. in which they occur, they are attributed to "John, Bishop of Jerusalem."[2] It would require a long investigation to go fully into this question, for which I have not space in this work. But no impartial person, I conceive, can read these Lectures, and not be convinced that they are not the work of one hand. For, to mention nothing else, the sentences are sometimes addressed to an *individual*, and sometimes to *an assembly of persons;* and the two are mixed up together just as they might be if two different works on the same subject had been put together, but as they could not be in a work produced by one hand. The Lectures profess to have been delivered to a body of persons, recently baptized; and therefore they ought to use the plural number throughout, and for the most part this is the case. And what is especially observable—but which I have not seen noticed by those who have written on this subject—is, that the passages adduced from these Lectures in favor of such doctrine as that maintained by the Authors under review, are *all taken from the parts in which the language is addressed to an individual.*

That these Lectures are founded upon Lectures delivered by Cyril, and may contain much that was written by him, is very probable. But beyond that, I conceive it to be impossible to make him responsible for them. If used, as it is said that they were, as a work permanently serving the purposes of the Church at Jerusalem for the instruction of the young, they were very

[1] Andrews, Answer to Card. Perron, p. 36; in his Opusc. Posthuma. 1629. 4to.
[2] Andrews, ibid.; and Milles. Præf. ad Op. Cyrill. Hieros. Oxon. 1703. fol.

liable, in that age of the Church, when there was no controlling power to check the alteration of such books by the Bishop, to have additions made to them from time to time. And this may account for the strange mixture we meet with in them of statements of a very dissimilar character.[1]

I shall not, however, now enter further upon the question of their genuineness. I will consider them as they stand, though not admitting their genuineness in their present state.

The passages quoted by Archdeacon Wilberforce as directly maintaining his doctrine, are the following. I give them as cited by the Archdeacon:[2]—

"The bread in the Eucharist, after the invocation of the Holy Ghost, is mere bread no longer, but the Body of Christ."[3]

"Contemplate, therefore, the bread and wine not as bare elements, for they are, according to the Lord's declaration, the Body and Blood of Christ; for though sense suggests this to thee, let faith stablish thee. Judge not the matter from taste, but from faith be fully assured without misgiving, that thou hast been vouchsafed the Body and Blood of Christ."[4]

"Fully persuaded, that what seems bread is not bread, though bread by taste, but the Body of Christ; and that what seems wine

[1] It appears to me that these remarks would also apply to the other Catechetical Lectures that now pass under the name of Cyril. They are not even attributed to him in all the MSS. And there is the same variation from the singular to the plural number, which I have noticed above in the Mystagogical Lectures. But I need not here enter further into that question; referring the reader, however, both with respect to these and the Mystagogical Lectures, to Andr. Riveti Critica Sacra, lib. iii. cc. 8—11, and Albertini De Euchar. p. 422, (whose remarks are reprinted in Milles's edition of the works of Cyril), and also to Casim. Oudin. Comment. De Scriptor. Eccles. Lips. 1722. tom. i. col. 456 et seq. The remarks of Oudin, showing from internal testimony the improbability that these Lectures could have been those of Cyril, appear to me to have great weight. The Lectures of Cyril are said by Jerome to have been written when he was young, which would bring them to about the year 350; while it is evident that the Creed expounded in these Lectures (Lect. vi.—xviii.) is that established at the Council of Constantinople in 381, which Cyril survived only about five years.

[2] Wilb. Doctr. of Euch. p. 75; or, 3rd ed. p. 64. The second and third passages are again urged, pp. 230 and 267; or, 3rd ed. pp. 196 and 229.

[3] It forms part of a passage given p. 401 above.

[4] Μὴ πρόσεχε οὖν ὡς ψιλοῖς τῷ ἄρτῳ καὶ τῷ οἴνῳ· σῶμα γὰρ καὶ αἷμα Χριστοῦ κατὰ τὴν δεσποτικὴν τυγχάνει ἀπόφασιν. Εἰ γὰρ καὶ ἡ αἴσθησίς σοι τοῦτο ὑποβάλλει, ἀλλὰ ἡ πίστις σε βεβαιούτω. Μὴ ἀπὸ τῆς γεύσεως κρίνῃς τὸ πρᾶγμα, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ τῆς πίστεως πληροφοροῦ ἀνενδοιάστως, σώματος καὶ αἵματος Χριστοῦ καταξιωθείς. Auct. sub nom. Cyrill. Hieros. Catech. Myst. iv. 2. Op. ed. Milles. Oxon. 1703. p. 293.

is not wine, though the taste will have it so, but the Blood of Christ."[1]

Now, as it respects the first of these passages, it is only necessary to add the context to it, and the Archdeacon's argument disappears. The whole passage, as already quoted, stands thus:[2]—

"But see that you do not look upon it [the consecrated chrism] as if it was mere ointment; for as the bread of the Eucharist, after the invocation of the Holy Spirit, is no longer simple bread, but the Body of Christ, *so also* that holy ointment is no longer simple, nor as one might say common ointment after invocation, but the charisma of Christ, and by the presence of the Holy Spirit brings his divinity into operation."

The change in the bread, therefore, he supposed to be similar to that in the ointment.

And therefore, as I have already observed,[3] we may see in this passage what was the nature of the change alluded to in another passage of Cyril, quoted by the Archdeacon[4] in support of his doctrine, which I will give in his own words:—

"We call upon the merciful God to send forth his Holy Spirit upon the gifts lying before him; that he may make the bread the Body of Christ, and the wine the Blood of Christ; for whatsoever the Holy Ghost has touched is sanctified and changed."[5]

The bread and wine are changed just as the ointment is changed.

And in another passage the writer still more clearly shows the nature of the *change* of which he here speaks. For he says,—

"For as the bread and wine of the Eucharist, before the sacred invocation of the adorable Trinity, was mere bread and wine, but after the invocation the bread becomes the body of Christ and the wine the blood of Christ, *exactly in the same manner* such meats of

[1] Ταῦτα μαθὼν καὶ πληροφορηθεὶς, ὡς ὁ φαινόμενος ἄρτος, οὐκ ἄρτος ἐστὶν, εἰ καὶ τῇ γεύσει αἰσθητὸς, ἀλλὰ σῶμα Χριστοῦ, καὶ ὁ φαινόμενος οἶνος, οὐκ οἶνος ἐστὶν, εἰ καὶ ἡ γεῦσις τοῦτο βούλεται, ἀλλὰ αἷμα Χριστοῦ. Id. ib. § 3. p. 294.

[2] See pp. 400, 401 above.

[3] See p. 401 above.

[4] Wilb. On Euch. p. 275; or, 3rd ed. p. 236.

[5] I have given the original of this passage p. 401, above.

the pomps of the devil [i. e. those offered to evil spirits at heathen festivals], being in their own nature unadulterated, become through the invocation of evil spirits impure."[1]

Certainly, therefore, the testimony of Cyril in this passage will by no means justify the conclusion drawn from it by the Archdeacon, that Cyril considered "that after consecration the thing present upon the altar is truly the Body and Blood of Christ;"[2] whether the presence is supposed to be by transubstantiation or consubstantiation.

With respect to the two other passages, so far as concerns the declaration, that the bread and wine are not to be looked upon as *bare elements*, but the Body and Blood of Christ, this is only similar to his declaration (just noticed) respecting the ointment. But as to the declaration, that the bread and wine are *not* bread and wine, though the *taste* indicates that they *are*, but the body and blood of Christ, this, *taken alone*, is consistent only with some such doctrine as Transubstantiation. According to these words, viewed in themselves, the substance of the bread and wine is gone. There is neither bread nor wine, though the taste somehow remains.

The doctrine of Dr. Pusey and Archdeacon Denison, therefore, is as much opposed by these words as that which is maintained in this work. And it is difficult to understand how Archdeacon Wilberforce could reconcile them with the statements he makes in other parts of his work.

But if we understand these words in this sense, they are clearly opposed to other statements in the same work. They are opposed to those which I have just noticed, indicating the character of the change which passes upon the bread and wine. They are also opposed to others.

I might notice, for instance, the statement, that it was of the

[1] See p. 401, above. I may here observe, that this passage, and the others just quoted, showing the *nature* of the change supposed by the writer of these Lectures to take place in the bread and wine, furnish a very sufficient answer to the passage the Romanists adduce for their doctrine of Transubstantiation from Catech. iv. 1, containing the reference to our Lord's change of water into wine. But as the Authors under review do not take this ground, I need only thus notice the fact. Indeed, Dr. Pusey has himself well and fully met the Romish argument from this passage in his "Notes," &c. pp. 277—280.

[2] Wilb. On Euch. p. 275; or, 3rd ed. pp. 235, 236.

*bread* that our Lord said, "This is my body;"[1] whereas Bellarmine himself tells us, as we have seen,[2] that if our Lord said of *bread*, "This is my body," the words must be understood figuratively.

But the passage to which I would more especially refer is the following:—

"After these things hear ye him who chants according to the Divine song, exhorting you to the participation of the holy mysteries, and saying, 'Taste, and see that the Lord is gracious.' Do not commit the judgment to the bodily palate. No, but to unwavering faith. For in 'tasting,' they are not exhorted to taste bread and wine, but *the antitype of the body and blood of Christ.*"[3]

Here we have genuine primitive doctrine; and this occurs in the part where the plural number is used. The writer justly admonishes those who heard in the Communion Service the words, "Taste, and see that the Lord is gracious," not to think of food for the bodily palate, but to exercise faith, and receive the consecrated elements, not as bread and wine, but as the antitype—the symbol and representative—of the body and blood of Christ.

The meaning attached by the writer to the word *antitype* is clear, from the way in which he uses it elsewhere.

Thus he calls baptism "an antitype of the sufferings of Christ;"[4] and the chrism with which the baptized were anointed, "the antitype of the Holy Spirit."[5]

And remembering the way in which corruptions in doctrine have ordinarily crept in, we may perhaps see how such statements might be in time perverted and corrupted into those the Archdeacon has quoted.

Either, therefore, we must suppose, that the writer, when

[1] Εἰπόντος περὶ τοῦ ἄρτου, Τοῦτό μου ἐστὶ τὸ σῶμα. CYRILL. HIEROS. Catech. Myst. iv. 1. Op. ed. cit. p. 292. This is from the part where the plural number is used.

[2] See p. 71 above.

[3] Μετὰ ταῦτα ἀκούετε τοῦ ψάλλοντος μετὰ μέλους θείου, προτρεπομένου ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν κοινωνίαν τῶν ἁγίων μυστηρίων, καὶ λέγοντος, γεύσασθε καὶ ἴδετε, ὅτι χρηστὸς ὁ Κύριος. Μὴ τῷ λάρυγγι τῷ σωματικῷ ἐπιτρέπητε τὸ κριτικόν· οὐχί, ἀλλὰ τῇ ἀνενδοιάστῳ πίστει. Γευόμενοι γὰρ οὐκ ἄρτου καὶ οἴνου κελεύονται γεύσασθαι, ἀλλὰ ἀντιτύπου σώματος καὶ αἵματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ. ID. Cat. Myst. v. 17. Op. p. 300.

[4] Τῶν τοῦ Χριστοῦ παθημάτων ἀντίτυπον. Cat. Myst. ii. 5. p. 287.

[5] Τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος τὸ ἀντίτυπον. Ib. iii. i. p. 288. It is repeated a few lines further on, p. 289

denying that the bread and wine were after consecration bread and wine, meant that they were not *mere* bread and wine, though they were so as far as taste went,—just as the ointment was not *mere* ointment after consecration, but had acquired a different character—or we must admit, that these passages are inconsistent with others in the same Lectures, and therefore the production of another hand.

To my mind these Lectures bear clear marks of interpolation and corruption; and there can be no question which class of statements is the later of the two.

And it is observable, that Archdeacon Wilberforce himself finds fault with the Author of these Lectures, for a statement which he thinks does not seem to recognise the truth, "that the outward part, or that which is an object of sense, continues to discharge the functions of animal nutriment;"[1] and quotes it as an instance of that "exclusive attention to the notion of a change," observable in some of the Fathers, which was "not unlikely to lead to expressions, if not to thoughts, incompatible with this fundamental characteristic of a sacrament," that is, that the outward part should still nourish. The passage he alludes to is the one which I have quoted p. 334 above, and I do not admit that he has given the right sense of it; for he wishes it to be supposed that Cyril thought, that although the consecrated elements containing the Body of Christ were received into the mouth, they did not descend into the belly, but were absorbed into and mixed with the system; adopting, I suppose, the very nice distinction of Cardinal Perron in this place, that Cyril did not here mean *ventrem superiorem seu stomachum*, but *ventrem inferiorem seu alvum;* for even the Romanists do not deny, that they descend into the stomach, having rules prescribing what is to be done if they should be *cast up from the stomach*, which I shall not defile these pages by quoting.

But I refer to the remark made by Archdeacon Wilberforce on this passage, as showing that he himself admits, that the Fathers sometimes used incautious and incorrect language on this subject, appearing to carry too far the notion of a change in the

[1] Wilb. On Euch. p. 282; or, 3rd ed. p. 242.

elements, further than even the Romanists would extend it, who admit that the consecrated elements nourish the body.

It is worth notice also, that in one of the Catechetical Lectures, the writer distinctly maintains *the absence of Christ after the flesh*, and his presence only by the Spirit. For he says,—

"For, because he is now *absent as concerns the flesh*, you must not suppose from this, that he is not present here by the Spirit, hearing what is said of him, and beholding thy thoughts." [1]

But if there is a real presence of his flesh, in any form, on our Communion Tables, this could not be said.

Archdeacon Wilberforce further refers to the following passage in these Lectures, as showing that Cyril advocated the *adoration* of the elements, and thereby showed that he considered the real body and blood of Christ to be actually present under their forms. He directs men, says Archdeacon Wilberforce,[2]—

"To approach to the cup of his Blood, not stretching forth their hands, but bending, and saying in the way of worship and reverence, Amen." [3]

The passage, it will be observed, is again from that part in which the language is addressed to an individual.

But the words do not in the slightest degree authorize the inference which the Archdeacon has deduced from them, for the same words are used by other writers where no such adoration is intended.

Thus, as it respects "bending," Chrysostom says, that "the "king himself, when the Gospels are being read, stands with all "fear and all attention,[4] and does not suffer the crown to en-

[1] Μὴ γὰρ ὅτι σαρκὶ νῦν ἄπεστιν, παρὰ τοῦτο νομίσῃς, ὅτι καὶ Πνεύματι μέσος ἐνταῦθα πάρεστιν, ἀκούων τὰ περὶ αὐτοῦ λεγόμενα, καὶ βλέπων τὰ ἐν σοὶ νοούμενα. Catech. xiv. fin. p. 204. I suppose it will not be questioned that the above translation gives the true meaning of the passage, but there is evidently an incorrectness in the reading in one part of the sentence. I suspect that instead of *μέσος*, the true reading is *μή σοι*.

[2] Wilb. On Euch. p. 301; or, 3rd. ed. p. 259.

[3] Προσέρχου καὶ τῷ ποτηρίῳ τοῦ αἵματος, μὴ ἀνατείνων τὰς χεῖρας, ἀλλὰ κύπτων, καὶ τρόπῳ προσκυνήσεως καὶ σεβάσματος λέγων τὸ, Ἀμήν. Auct. sub nom. Cyrill. Hieros. Cat. Myst. v. 19. Op. 301.

[4] Ἵστανται μετὰ παντὸς φόβου καὶ μετὰ πάσης σπουδῆς.

"circle his head, but *bows down his head on account of God "speaking in his holy Gospels.*"[1]

So again as to the word "*worship,*" sometimes translated *adoration* (προσκυνήσεως), it is notorious that the word is often used to signify nothing more than veneration or reverence.[2]

And therefore our learned Bishop Andrews (in high repute with the party of the Authors under review), when meeting the argument of Cardinal Perron for a real presence under the forms of the bread and wine from this very passage, says,—

"He would have the party that receiveth it, κύπτειν, that is, to *bow himself*, and cast his eyes to the ground; that is, *in humble and reverent manner to do it.* . . . And τρόπῳ προσκυνήσεως, *after the manner of adoring*, amounteth not to *adoring;* for *after the manner*, or, *as men use to do that adore*, is a term qualified and restrained to the outward manner. . . . And for the term of *adoring* itself, the Cardinal confesseth after in the xxv. that *adoring* doth not alway import or signify *cultum divinum*, but only *venerationem.* And we, by the grace of God, hold the sacrament to be *venerable*, and with all due respect to be handled and received."[3]

The Archdeacon further maintains, that—

"Cyril's statements (Mystag. Lect. iv. 6, 9. v. 21.) as to the awe with which men should approach and handle that sacred food, and his caution not to consider it to be merely that which it appears to be, and to trust to faith rather than to sense, show that he could not possibly have imagined the Holy Eucharist to be a *mere* sign, but must have imagined the outward part to be an antitype or symbol of an inward reality."[4]

[1] Ὑποκύπτει διὰ τὸν ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις εὐαγγελίοις ὁμιλοῦντα Θεόν. CHRYS. Homil. in illud, Attendite ne eleemos. vestr. fac. &c. Op. ed. cit. viii. App. p. 93. This homily is placed by the Benedictines among the spurious ones, but it is given as Chrysostom's in the editions of Savile and others. At any rate, even if it was not written by Chrysostom, it illustrates the use of the word.

[2] If any reader wishes for proof, let him take the following, given by Albertinus, that the word is often used "pro veneratione et reverentia rebus sacris competenti:"—"Quo sensu Josephus (Antiquit. l. xiii. c. 5 et 6.) προσκύνησιν templis tribuit, et post Josephum Clerus Ecclesiæ Apameensis (In Concil. 6.); Constantius (Apud Athanas. De Synod. Arimin. et Seleuc.) προσκυνητὸν νόμον appellat, Isidorus Pelusiota (lib. iv. Epist. 27.) προσκυνούμενον Salvatoris sepulchrum, Leo Secundus (Concil sub Menna, Act. 5 ) Romam thronum Apostolicum προσκυνητὸν, Justinianus denique (Novell. 6.) baptismum alterum religionis Christianæ sacramentum προσκυνητὸν indigetat." ALBERT. De Euchar. p. 432.

[3] ANDREWS'S Answer to 18th ch. of 1st book of Card. Perron's Reply, &c. p. 3. In his Opuscula Posthuma. Lond. 1629. 4to.

[4] WILB. On Euch. pp. 234, 235; or, 3rd ed. pp. 200, 201.

No doubt he did not consider it "to be a *mere* sign," but "imagined the outward part to be an antitype or symbol of an inward reality;" and *therefore* he exhorted men to approach it with awe and reverence; and very justly so. And on the same ground he spoke of "the thing contemplated" as "mysterious and difficult;" as the Archdeacon urges. (p. 230. 3rd ed. p. 196.) But this is no evidence in favor of the Archdeacon's notion, that the symbol and the reality make one compound whole in the consecrated substances. And, as I have already shown,[1] *the same terms are used respecting baptism.*

And in the last of these passages referred to by the Archdeacon (v. 21.), the writer speaks of the communicant's "contact with the *holy body*,"[2] and exhorts him to "take heed not to let a *bit of it* fall from him."[3] Can Christ's body be broken into bits, or a bit of his real living body fall to the ground? If not, what is it which is here referred to but that which is *symbolically* and *representatively* Christ's Body? And this is also a sufficient answer to another similar passage quoted by the Archdeacon.[4]

Dr. Pusey quotes another passage (also from the part addressed to an individual) which I will give according to his own translation:[5]—

"Therefore with fullest assurance let us partake as of the Body and Blood of Christ: for in the figure [or, type, *as he elsewhere translates it*] of bread is given to thee his body, and in the figure of wine his blood, that thou, by partaking of the body and blood of Christ, mightest be made of the same body and the same blood with him. For thus we come to bear Christ in us, because his body and blood are diffused through our members; thus it is that, according to the blessed Peter, 'we become partakers of the Divine nature.'"

The words of Cyril that immediately follow ought to be added, which are these:—

"Christ formerly conversing with the Jews, said, 'Unless ye eat my flesh, and drink my blood, ye have no life in you.' They, *not understanding in a spiritual sense* the things spoken, were offended and went back, thinking that he called upon them to eat flesh."[6]

[1] See pp. 390, 391, above.

[2] Τῇ ἐπαφῇ τοῦ ἁγίου σώματος.

[3] Προσέχων μὴ παραπολέσῃς τι ἐκ τούτου αὐτοῦ. Ed. cit. p. 301.

[4] Wilb. On Euch. pp. 85, 86; or, 3rd ed. pp. 73, 74.

[5] Notes on Serm. p. 388.

[6] Ὥστε μετὰ πάσης πληροφορίας, ὡς σώματος καὶ αἵματος μεταλαμβάνωμεν Χριστοῦ. ἐν τύπῳ γὰρ ἄρτου, δίδοταί σοι τὸ σῶμα· καὶ ἐν τύπῳ οἴνου, δίδοταί σοι τὸ

In this passage Dr. Pusey contends that the phrase "*in* the type," &c. "expresses a real presence *under that outward veil,*" but contends against the Romanists, that "the term [*in*] does imply the existence of the elements, *in* which the Body and Blood of our Lord are said to be;"[1] the only difference between Dr. Pusey and the Romanists being, that the former holds that the real Body and Blood of Christ are in the bread and wine, and the latter hold that the real Body and Blood of Christ are in the accidents, or outward forms of the bread and wine.

Now, understanding the gift of the body and blood *in a spiritual sense,* as the writer himself tells us we ought to understand the words of our Lord, there is no difficulty in the statement, that in and by the symbolical body and blood the faithful receive the real body and blood. And this, I contend, is what the writer meant, not merely from what he has said elsewhere, as just quoted,—particularly in the statement that what we receive into our mouths is "the antitype of the body and blood of Christ,"—but from the words themselves.

For if he had meant what Dr. Pusey contends for, he would have said, *in the bread,* not *in the type of the bread;* and if he had meant what the Romanists contend for, he would not have used the word *type,* but some word implying the *outward forms* or *accidents* of the bread.

The language he has used shows, that he considered what was actually taken into the mouth was *bread,* made by consecration an effective *type* or *figure* of Christ's body, and instrumentally ministering to the worthy communicant the body of Christ.

In fact, it is difficult to understand how any one can seriously contend that ἐν τύπῳ means *inside* or *within* the type. I would appeal to any impartial Greek scholar whether the words do not obviously mean *by* or *by means of* the type of bread. The words

αἷμα· ἵνα γένῃ, μεταλαβὼν σώματος καὶ αἵματος Χριστοῦ, σύσσωμος καὶ σύναιμος αὐτοῦ. Οὕτω γὰρ καὶ Χριστοφόροι γινόμεθα, τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦ αἵματος εἰς τὰ ἡμέτερας ἀναδιδομένου μέλη· οὕτω κατὰ τὸν μακάριον Πέτρον, θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως γινόμεθα. Ποτὲ Χριστὸς τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις διαλεγόμενος, ἔλεγεν, Ἐὰν μὴ φάγητέ μου τὴν σάρκα, καὶ πίητέ μου τὸ αἷμα, οὐκ ἔχετε ζωὴν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς. Ἐκεῖνοι μὴ ἀκηκοότες πνευματικῶς τῶν λεγομένων, σκανδαλισθέντες, ἀπῆλθον εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω, νομίζοντες ὅτι ἐπὶ σαρκοφαγίαν αὐτοὺς προτρέπεται. Catech. Myst. iv. i. pp. 292, 293.

[1] Notes, p. 132.

ἐν τύπῳ are in common use with the Fathers,[1] and nowhere, as far as I am aware, can they be reasonably interpreted as meaning *within* or *inside* the type.

Now it is perfectly true that *by* or *by means of* the type of bread and wine the worthy communicant becomes spiritually a partaker of the real body and blood of Christ.

And thus he is made *concorporal* with Christ, and *bears Christ in him,* not from having orally swallowed the real body of Christ, but from this spiritual reception of Christ. For these words do not in the least imply a bodily conjunction with Christ's body, for they are continually used by the Fathers to denote the effects of *faith* and of *baptism.*

This we have already seen ;[2] and, among other Fathers, Chrysostom tells us, that we are "made of one substance with him by faith,"[3] and that we are made "of his flesh and bones," and "mingled with and joined to his body" by baptism.[4]

And so Isidore of Pelusium, speaking of the benefits of *baptism,* says, that—

"Our nature becomes a coheir of the Only-begotten, and is made *concorporal with him* by a participation of the holy mysteries, and is reckoned *as his flesh,* and is so united to him as the body to the head."[5]

And as to the phrase, "bearing Christ in us," Cyril himself uses it, in the Introductory Lecture to his Catechetical Lectures, with reference either to those who have been just baptized, or to the baptismal waters (for the words leave it somewhat doubtful), and in either case shows, by such an application of the word, that he does not use it as signifying any real presence of Christ's body within us.[6]

[1] Τοῖς ἐν τύπῳ γεγενημενοίς ——— τὸ μάννα τὸ ἀληθινὸν . . . ὡς ἐν τύπῳ τῷ μάννα χορηγεῖσθαι τοῖς ἀρχαιοτέροις. Cyrill. Alex. In Johann. lib. iii. Op. iv. 312, 313. Multitudes of examples might be added if necessary.

[2] See pp. 374—381 above. [3] See p. 376 above. [4] See pp. 378, 379, above.

[5] Ἐγένετο συγκληρονόμος τοῦ μονογενοῦς, καὶ σύσσωμος αὐτῷ διὰ τῆς μετοχῆς τῶν ἱερῶν μυστηρίων κατέστη, καὶ εἰς τὴν σάρκα αὐτοῦ τελεῖ· καὶ ὥσπερ τὸ σῶμα τῇ κεφαλῇ, οὕτως αὐτῷ ἥνωται. Isidori Pelus. Epist. lib. iii. ep. 195. Ed. Paris. 1638. p. 333.

[6] Ὑδάτων ἀπολαύσητε Χριστοφόρων ἐχόντων εὐωδίαν. Cyrill. Hieros. Præf. ad Catech. § 9. Op. ed. cit. p. 11.—Albertinus, p. 428, will supply to those who desire it abundant instances of a similar use of the word "Christ-bearing" by the Fathers.

### Ambrose. (fl. a. 374.)

Among the Fathers quoted by Archdeacon Wilberforce and Dr. Pusey, Ambrose holds a distinguished place.

To the statements of this Father I have also had occasion frequently to call the attention of the reader in the second Section of this chapter. I shall therefore, in the first place, remind the reader what the passages already quoted show to have been his doctrine on the subject before us.

We have seen, then, that Ambrose held, that we have *here* only the *shadow* and *image* of Christ and heavenly things, and that in *heaven only* can we find the *reality*;[1] that anything which is present simultaneously "throughout widely separated regions," and is "infused simultaneously into many, and is not seen," must be an "uncircumscribed" substance, and therefore *divine*;[2] which not being the nature of the Body of Christ, he could not have held it to be so present; that now we "ought not to seek Christ on the earth, nor in the earth, nor according to the flesh, if we wish to find him," and cannot touch him, if we seek him on earth, but only as Stephen "touched him, because he sought him in heaven;"[3] for that Christ now "is touched by faith, is seen by faith," "nor does he touch him, who does not touch him with faith:"[4] that he who receives and eats the Living Bread, Christ, can never die.[5] And, like other Fathers, he speaks of what he calls "the Blood of Christ" in the Eucharist in terms not applicable to our Lord's real blood, present in an immaterial form, but only applicable to the material element.[6]

In these passages, then, we have very sufficient evidence what was the doctrine of Ambrose on our present subject; and in the recollection of these testimonies, let us proceed to consider the grounds on which he is claimed by Archdeacon Wilberforce and Dr. Pusey as a supporter of their views.

I would observe first, that *all* but one of the passages cited from him by Archdeacon Wilberforce in defence of his doctrine,[7]

[1] See pp. 266, 267, above. [2] See p. 294 above. [3] See p. 320 above.
[4] See p. 420 above. [5] See pp. 367, 368, above. [6] See p. 244 above.
[7] Wilb. On Euch. pp. 11; 73, 74; 91; 156; 170; 174; 230, 231; 267; 290; 305; 336; or, 3rd ed. pp. 8, 9; 62, 63; 78; 133; 146; 149; 196, 197; 229; 249; 262, 263; 289. Ambrose's treatise "De fide" is briefly referred to in pp. 11, 217, 277, and 290; but only passingly.

and almost all that can with any show of reason be urged for the maintenance of the doctrine here opposed out of those cited by Dr. Pusey,[1] are taken from one work; and that one a work whose genuineness is notoriously denied by some, and considered doubtful, to say the least, by others (of which fact, however, not a hint is given by either of the Authors just mentioned), and which may, I think, easily be proved *not* to be genuine; especially to those who admit (as the writers just mentioned do) that the work entitled "De Sacramentis" was not written by him. The work to which I refer is that entitled "De Mysteriis," or sometimes, "De iis qui Mysteriis initiantur;" and it is clearly a portion of the work "De Sacramentis."

As there is no controversy now respecting the genuineness of the work "De Sacramentis," it being admitted not to be the production of Ambrose, a proof that the "De Mysteriis" forms part of it, will be sufficient to show that this also is not the work of Ambrose.

Now, first, it is stated by Oudin,[2] that in all the MSS. of the work "De Sacramentis" he had seen (and he asserts that he had *seen more than one hundred* in different libraries in France), that work consisted of *seven* books or *sermons* (as he with good reason thinks they ought to be called), of which that now entitled "De Mysteriis" was the first. And, as he points out, the Benedictine Editors themselves admit, that this is the case as it respects *some* MSS.;[3] though they ought to have said, according to Oudin, "most or all."[4]

Moreover it is quoted by Ratramnus, in his reply to Pas-

[1] Pusey, Notes, &c. pp. 454—467. And see also pp. 104, 105, 229—232, and 288—296.

[2] See Casimir. Oudin. Commentarius De Scriptor. Eccles. Lips. 1722, col. 1827 et seq. This work of Oudin is less known than it deserves to be. The author evidently wrote from personal examination and research, and not upon the mere judgment of others, as is too often the case, and of which (as it appears to me) we see a good deal in Cave and others. There is much valuable matter in Oudin, the result of his own careful investigations.

[3] Observing that the sermons "De Sacramentis" were probably written for the Octave of Easter, a sermon being for each day except the first, they add,—"Sed nec aliunde ortum videtur, ut in MSS. aliquot liber *De Mysteriis* inscribatur *primus de Sacramentis*; qui vero primus est *de Sacramentis* in secundum ordinem dejiciatur, et sic deinceps." Præf. ad libr. De Sacram.

[4] It is evident from the statements of Oudin, who had carefully availed himself of his opportunities, as a monk, of access to the various monastic libraries of

chasius, in the ninth century, as a portion of the work "De Sacramentis."

Further, although the Benedictine Editors, wishing to maintain the genuineness of the book, or rather sermon, "De Mysteriis," but at the same time compelled to admit that the "De Sacramentis" is not the production of Ambrose, allege a *difference* of style between the two; yet Bellarmine, Cardinal Perron, and Natalis Alexander, wishing to prove the genuineness of *both*, maintain that the style is so clearly *the same*, that it is evident that both are the production of the same author. And I think the impartial reader will be inclined to agree with the latter.

The last evidence I shall notice seems to me conclusive. It is this. In that which is commonly called the *first* book "De Sacramentis" (c. 5.), occurs the following passage, — "Ecce "quasi columba Spiritus Sanctus descendit. Non columba "descendit, sed quasi columba. *Memento quid dixerim:* Christus "carnem suscepit, non sicut carnem, sed carnis istius veritatem, "veram carnem Christus suscepit: Spiritus autem sanctus non "in veritate columbæ, sed in specie columbæ descendit de "cœlo." [1]

But where is the passage to which he refers when he says, "*Memento quid dixerim,—Remember what I said?*" Nowhere except in the book, or sermon, "De Mysteriis" (c. 4.), where we find a passage exactly answering to this reference, in which he says, speaking of the words "in specie columbæ Spiritum descendisse,"—"Merito ergo sicut columba descendit, ut ad-"moneret nos simplicitatem columbæ habere debere. Speciem "autem et *pro veritate* accipiendam legimus et *de Christo*: 'Et "specie inventus ut homo' (Phil. ii. 7.): et de Patre Deo: "'Neque speciem ejus vidistis.' (Joh. v. 37.)" [2]

Here is a tolerably clear proof, that the sermon "De Mys-

France to search for himself on these points, that the Benedictine Editors have not dealt fairly by us in this matter. And he tells us that "in the presence of the Benedictines themselves" he had stated that the testimony of the MSS. was that the "De Mysteriis," and the "De Sacramentis" are by the same author. (col. 1832.) The Benedictine Editors are, I suspect, not more to be trusted than other Romish Editors. And too much reliance has been generally placed on them.

[1] Inter Ambros. Op. ed. cit. tom. ii. col. 353.

[2] Inter Ambros. Op. ed. cit. ii. 331.

teriis" is part of the work "De Sacramentis," and precedes what is now ordinarily called the first book, or sermon, of that work.

Various other arguments are added by Oudin, but these seem to me sufficient.

It is therefore quite immaterial, as far as Ambrose is concerned, what may be the value of the passages adduced from this work in support of the doctrine of the Authors under review.

But even in this work, though there is much that savours of a later age than that of Ambrose, and an author of less correct views, there is also much that is inconsistent with the doctrine in question, and much that, amidst an obscure and injudicious phraseology, clearly favors sound doctrine on the subject.

The passage which is most relied upon for the support of the doctrine here opposed, Archdeacon Wilberforce gives thus :—

"St. Ambrose, then, after speaking of the regenerating force of Baptism, goes on to affirm, that in the Holy Eucharist is vouchsafed the real presence of Christ's Body and Blood. 'You may perhaps say, that which I see is something different: how do you prove to me that I receive the Body of Christ? This is what it remains for me to prove. What examples, therefore, am I to use? Let me prove that this is not that which nature has made it, but that which the benediction has consecrated it to be: and that the force of the benediction is greater than that of nature, because by the benediction nature herself is changed.' And then, after citing various instances from the Old Testament, in which an external element had been made the means of conferring an inward gift, and of the influence exercised by the one upon the other, ending with the mystery of the Incarnation, he concludes,—'Our Lord Jesus Christ himself proclaims, *This is my Body*. Before the sacred words of benediction another species is named, after consecration the Body is implied [or rather, *signified—significatur*]. He himself speaks of his blood [or, rather, *says that it is his blood—dicit suum sanguinem*]. Before consecration it is spoken of as another thing. After consecration it is named Blood. And you (i.e. the receiver) say, Amen—that is, it is true. What your mouth expresses, let your inner mind confess —feel what you say.'"[1]

The force of this passage clearly lies in the expressions, that the Eucharistical element is "not that which nature has made it," and that "nature herself is changed." And the examples

[1] Wilb. On Euch. pp. 74, 75. See also pp. 11 and 267.

that follow might, in themselves, appear to indicate, that these words are to be received in their full and most literal sense; that is, that there is an intrinsic change of some kind or other,—not necessarily of a *substantial* kind, for some of the examples refer only to changes of *quality*, but still a real internal change,—in the element itself.

I would observe, then, first, that as it respects the doctrine of Consubstantiation (which is that maintained by Archdeacon Denison and Dr. Pusey), it is clear that this passage gives no countenance to it. For the *change* here spoken of is in those things which form the symbols; while, according to that doctrine, the bread and wine remain what they were before, but have the Body and Blood of Christ *united* to them, so as to form, without intercommunication of properties, one compound whole with them; and the effect produced by receiving that compound whole is produced entirely by the Body and Blood of Christ. This is clearly not the doctrine of the passage before us; in which the effect produced is attributed to a change in the nature of the bread and wine themselves, which must be either a *substantial* change, making them the Body and Blood of Christ *instead of* bread and wine, or a change of *character* and *effect*, making them instrumentally productive of effects beyond their natural power. And no such change is contemplated in the doctrine of Consubstantiation. For, according to that doctrine, both the substantial change is repudiated, and, though the bread and wine may by consecration be made signs and symbols of Christ's body and blood, they have not the slightest effect in producing any spiritual benefit to the receiver; but the effect is produced *directly*, and without any intervening *instrumentality*, by the real Body and Blood of Christ.

And Dr. Pusey, wishing to prove that this passage does not favor the doctrine of Transubstantiation, resorts to the argument by which it may be as forcibly shown that it does not favor his own doctrine. For he justly points out,[1] that this author applies one of those illustrations he uses with reference to the change in the Eucharistic elements,—showing how the nature of things is changed by the Divine benediction,—to indicate the nature of the change produced by consecration in the

[1] pp. 288 et seq.

water of Baptism; namely, the change produced in the waters of Marah by Moses casting wood into them, and they became sweet. This Author, using this illustration, says, that, "Thus "into this font the priest casts the preaching of the Cross of the "Lord, and the water *becomes sweet for grace;*" immediately adding,—"Therefore believe not the eyes of thy body only; "that which is not seen is best seen; because the other is "looked at as temporal, this as eternal, which is not appre- "hended by the eyes, but is perceived by the soul and mind."[1]

And proceeding to the history of Naaman, in further illustration of his subject, he uses these words,—"What is water "without the cross of Christ? A common element, without any "sacramental efficacy. . . . Believe then that the waters are *not* "*empty.*"[2] And again, speaking of the miracle of the pool of Siloam, he says,—"That pool was for a figure, that thou mayest believe that *a Divine power descends into this font.*"[3]

Now, is it pretended from these words, that this writer considered the water of baptism to be either *substantially changed* into something else, or to be *united* to something else so joined with it as to become a compound whole with it, or that *the Divine power* actually descends into the *water itself?* No, not by any one. But it is acknowledged, that this was the mode of speaking then adopted to describe that sacramental change by which the water became *instrumental,* through the Divine power accompanying it, for working in *worthy* recipients the objects of the rite.

And I must here again remind the reader of the numerous testimonies already given[4] that the Fathers were accustomed to use language respecting the water of baptism as strongly denoting a *change* in it by consecration as any which is used here or elsewhere respecting a change in the Eucharistic ele-

[1] Ita et in hunc fontem sacerdos prædicationem Dominicæ crucis mittit, et aqua fit dulcis ad gratiam . . . Non ergo solis corporis tui credas oculis: magis videtur quod non videtur; &c. De Myst. c. iii. or, §§ 14, 15. Inter Op. Ambros. ii. 328.

[2] Quid est enim aqua sine cruce Christi? Elementum commune, sine ullo sacramenti effectu. . . . Crede ergo quia non sunt *vacuæ* aquæ. Ib. c. iv. or, §§ 20, 21, col. 330.

[3] Ergo et illa piscina in figura; ut credas quia *in hunc fontem vis divina descendit.* Ib. § 23. col. 331.

[4] See pp. 395—417 above.

ments, and even directly paralleling one with the other. And in the same way they spoke of other things, often speaking of a change in the *nature* of things, where nothing more was meant than that they acted differently from what they *naturally* do; as, for instance, Chrysostom speaks respecting the lions and the furnace at Babylon.[1]

Here is the true answer to the doctrine respecting the Eucharist, raised by the Romanists and the Authors under review out of the passages above quoted; and an answer which is equally valid against the doctrine of Consubstantiation as against that of Transubstantiation.

Archdeacon Wilberforce, referring again elsewhere[2] to the same passage, observes, that it "plainly affirms our Lord's presence to be a mystery and a wonder," which he thinks incompatible with the doctrine he is opposing. But I have already shown,[3] that the Fathers used the same words respecting baptism, and therefore they prove nothing for such a presence as that which the Archdeacon maintains.

The Archdeacon also quotes[4] from this work the words, "this Body which we form was born of the Virgin,"[5] as proving that the writer held that it is Christ's "body natural which was crucified" that is really present in or under the elements. Now certainly the body born of the Virgin and crucified was *material*, and therefore if these words are to be taken literally, we eat the material flesh and blood that came forth from the Virgin. But that the writer meant only that it is *sacramentally* that Body, is clear from the words that immediately follow,—"It was the true flesh of Christ which was crucified and buried. Therefore it is truly *the sacrament of his flesh.*"[6] And yet the Archdeacon quotes[7] this latter passage as if it was favorable to his views.

Further, the Archdeacon urges[8] that Ambrose says, that "Christ is in that sacrament, because it is the Body of Christ." But certainly the words[9] do not mean what the Archdeacon

[1] See p. 413 above. [2] pp. 230, 231. [3] See pp. 390, 391 above. [4] p. 336.

[5] Et hoc quod conficimus corpus, ex Virgine est. c. ix. or, § 53. col. 339.

[6] Vera utique caro Christi, quæ crucifixa est, quæ sepulta est: vere ergo carnis illius sacramentum est. Ibid.

[7] pp. 156 and 290. [8] pp. 91 and 174.

[9] In illo sacramento Christus est, quia corpus est Christi. c. ix. or, § 58. I should not translate these words precisely as the Archdeacon has done.

would have them signify, because the very next words are,—"Therefore it is *not* corporal meat, but it is spiritual meat."[1] But the doctrine of the Archdeacon would turn it into *corporal meat*, for according to him the Body of Christ is eaten by the bodily mouth; and thus (whatever *words* the Archdeacon may use respecting it) is made *corporal meat*.

The remaining passage quoted by the Archdeacon is evidently *opposed* to his views, namely the following:—

"That food which you receive, that living bread which descends from heaven, ministers the substance of eternal life; and *whoever has eaten this, shall never die;* and it is the Body of Christ."[2]

But is it the case, that whoever has eaten *the consecrated Eucharistic bread* shall never die? If not, this passage *refutes* the doctrine of the Authors under review.

If we take this work, therefore, as a whole (as we ought to do), and do not rest our conclusions on certain isolated passages, we may at once see that it does not support the doctrine here opposed.

And as it seems pretty clear that it forms part of the work "De Sacramentis," I would remind the reader of two passages quoted above from that work, which may tend still further to illustrate the real views of the author; one, where he tells us that in the Eucharist we "drink *the likeness* of Christ's precious blood;"[3] and the other, where he says that "it is not that bread which *goes into the body*, but the bread of eternal life, which supports the substance of our soul."[4] And when this author says, that the elements after consecration "both are what they were, and are changed into something else,"[5] he appears to me to speak quite consistently with the doctrine here maintained; and I am ready to accept Dr. Pusey's interpretation of these words,—"Physically they are what they were: sacramentally they are the Body and Blood of Christ."[6] But I must be permitted to interpret the word *sacramentally* differently from Dr. Pusey.

I proceed to the single passage quoted by Archdeacon Wilber-

[1] Non ergo corporalis esca, sed spiritalis est. Ibid.
[2] See p. 368 above.
[3] See p. 267 above.
[4] See p. 332 above.
[5] Ut sint quæ erant, et in aliud commutentur. De Sacr. iv. 4. Op. ii. 369.
[6] Serm. p. 42.

force from the genuine works of Ambrose. He quotes it to prove that Ambrose held that Christ is "present as an object of worship in the Holy Eucharist," that is, he means, in or under the consecrated Eucharistic elements; before which, therefore, we are to bow down in worship, as containing the Body of Christ. It occurs in a passage which forms part of a somewhat far-fetched argument for the adoration of the Holy Spirit, from the consideration that adoration is given to Christ's body, and that Christ's body was born of the Virgin through the influence of the Holy Spirit. It is thus given by the Archdeacon:[1]—

"By the footstool is understood earth, but by earth the Flesh of Christ, which even at this day we adore in the mysteries, and which the apostles adored in our Lord Jesus Christ: for Christ is not divided, but one; nor when he is adored as the Son of God, is he denied as born of the Virgin."[2]

But, in the first place, Ambrose does not say that we adore it in the Eucharist, but in "the mysteries," or sacraments. There is no reason why we should limit this to the Eucharist only, and not understand it as referring to *both* sacraments. There is nothing in the context to intimate that it is to be so limited. And, as we have already seen,[3] Ambrose maintains that Christ is truly present at *baptism*, saying, with special reference to *baptism*, "I find thee in thy sacraments." So Gaudentius says, "We believe Christ to be in his sacraments;"[4] and Optatus, that Christ is "*introduced into the waters of the font;*"[5] and Cyril of Alexandria, that "the Son of God himself *invisibly floats upon the waters of the holy font.*"[6] Moreover the Fathers tell us, that we eat the flesh of Christ, and drink his blood, in *baptism*.[7] If therefore we are called upon by this passage to adore Christ as present in the bread, we are equally called upon by it to adore him as present in the baptismal font.

Still further, the words do not imply, that we are to adore the

[1] p. 305.

[2] Per scabellum (Ps. xcviii. 5., Is. lxvi. 1.) terra intelligitur: per terram autem caro Christi, quam hodieque in mysteriis adoramus, et quam Apostoli in Domino Jesu, ut supra diximus, adorarunt; neque enim divisus est Christus, sed unus: neque cum adoratur tanquam Dei Filius, natus ex Virgine denegatur. AMBROS. De Spir. S. iii. 11.; or, § 79. Op. ii. 681.

[3] See p. 382 above. [4] See p. 383 above. [5] Ibid. [6] Ibid.

[7] See pp. 326—328 above.

Body of Christ *as contained in the elements*, but only that we adore it *in the sacramental rite*. And were we to understand the words in the former sense, they would convey a meaning directly opposed to the express testimony of Ambrose elsewhere, as already quoted,[1] namely, that we ought not to seek Christ on the earth, nor in the earth, nor according to the flesh, and can only touch him, as Stephen did, by seeking him in heaven.

In the sacraments doubtless the Body of Christ is specially adored. In *both* we seek communion with that Body as the Body of the Divine Word, and worship the Body born of the Virgin as the Body of one of the Persons of the Godhead. And in the sacrament of the Eucharist we recognize the real Body of Christ to be *symbolically* present, and we adore it as *symbolically* present, but not the symbol which represents it, nor *any local presence in or with the symbol;* knowing, as Ambrose tells us, that we are not to look for the presence of that body on the earth.

Of the passages quoted by Dr. Pusey, besides those I have already considered, none appear to me to require any special examination. The only ones among them that could *seem* to support the doctrine in question, are those which speak of the consecrated elements under the name of the Body and Blood of Christ. Of the meaning of such phraseology, however, it cannot be necessary again to speak, after having so frequently pointed it out, and proved what it is.

But I must add, that, as in other cases, Dr. Pusey has given several passages which clearly testify *against* his doctrine; as, for instance, the two that are quoted p. 367 above.

The Romanists are in the habit of quoting in support of their doctrine two other passages from Ambrose which speak of the elements being *transfigured* by consecration.[2] But respecting this phrase, it will be sufficient here to refer the reader to the remarks already made in a previous page on phraseology of this kind as applied to the effect of consecration on the elements.[3]

[1] See p. 320 above.

[2] Ambros. De fide, iv. 10; or, § 124. Op. ii. 544. De Incarn. Domin. Sacr. c. 4; or, § 23. ii. 709.

[3] See pp. 408—413 above.

### Augustine (fl. a. 396).

The next Father whose testimony, as alleged by the Authors under review, I propose to consider, is Augustine; and it will be admitted, I conceive, on all hands, that his evidence on such a point as that now before us is of the highest value for determining the doctrine that prevailed among the sounder members of the Church in the fourth century. And the only difficulty that presents itself in placing before the reader his views on the subject, and showing to the satisfaction of every impartial mind that his statements, instead of supporting, are completely opposed to the doctrine of the Authors under review, is from the voluminousness of the testimony which may be adduced from his writings. It appears to me difficult to conceive, that any one versed in his writings, and able to take a general survey of his testimony on the subject, can come to the conclusion that he held the doctrine either of the Romanists or of the Authors under review. As to any *direct* statements in his writings in favor of such doctrine, there are none; while, as we have already seen, passages *adverse* to such doctrine are abundant. In fact, the whole weight of the argument derived from his works by the Romanists and the Authors under review, rests, partly, on a few passages which speak of wicked men as eating and drinking the Body and Blood of Christ (which his own statements elsewhere explain as only meaning, that they eat what is *called* the Body and Blood of Christ, as being so *representatively* or *sacramentally*); and partly, on one or two ill-understood passages as to Christ's flesh being worshipped in the Eucharist. For as to the passages in which he calls the consecrated elements by the name of the Body and Blood of Christ, after the extracts already given from him,[1] expressly stating that the signs were commonly called by the names of the things signified by them, it is obvious that they can have no weight in the argument.

The direct testimony of Augustine in favor of the doctrine maintained in this work has been so fully pointed out in the second Section of this Chapter, that upon that point it is un-

[1] See pp. 247, 248 above; and compare pp. 241, 242.

necessary here to do more than refer the reader to that Section. For even to recapitulate the points which have been established on his testimony, would be to go through almost all the heads of that Section.

I shall now, therefore, proceed to consider the testimonies adduced from him in support of the doctrine here opposed. And first, those that are cited by Archdeacon Wilberforce; which I shall examine in connexion with the different points he seeks to establish from them. He cites Augustine as maintaining,—

(1.) That Christ's body, while existing in a material form in heaven, can at the same time be present, in an immaterial form, in, or under the form of, the Eucharistic bread, in any number of places on earth.[1]

While compelled to admit that our Lord's risen body must be "present under a definite form and in a definite place," and that Augustine distinctly maintains this, he goes on to quote a passage from Augustine (Serm. 277, c. 12.)—speaking of our Lord's passing his body through closed doors—as proving that Augustine considered our Lord's body to have gained, by its union with the Godhead, "conditions very different from those which are usual to men," and to be thus able to be in one place in a material form, and at the same time in numberless other places in an immaterial form. A more unfortunate quotation could not have been made; for, in *the very next words* to those quoted by the Archdeacon, Augustine proceeds to intimate, that *our bodies*, after the resurrection, will be able to do the same. More, I think, need not be added, especially as I have already fully noticed this point, and given the passage at length.[2]

(2.) That the *sacramentum* and the *res sacramenti* are "united by the act of consecration into a compound whole;" "so united, that they must needs go together; and whoso receives the one, receives the other."[3]

For this argument one passage is cited, which I have already quoted at length, and shown to be utterly useless for the Archdeacon's purpose;[4] and, under the 8th head of the second

[1] Wilb. Doctr. of Euch. pp. 154—156; or, 3rd ed. pp. 132, 133.
[2] See pp. 151—153 above.
[3] See Wilb. Doctr. of Euch. pp. 118—120; or, 3rd ed. 100, 101.
[4] See p. 257 above.

Section of this Chapter, have shown that Augustine's statements are directly opposed to the doctrine here ascribed to him. [1]

(3.) That consecration "endows the outward sign with the inward reality." [2]

What are his proofs? The two following passages:—

"But our bread and cup...become to us mystical [or, sacramental] by a certain consecration, and are not so by nature. Moreover, what does not become so, although it may be bread and a cup, is a food for nourishment, not a sacrament of religion." [3]

"The word is added to the element, and it becomes a sacrament." [4]

Now, does any one deny, that before consecration the bread and wine are common bread and wine, that might be used for any purpose, and have no particular blessing attached to their use; and that, after consecration, they are no longer common, but set apart for a sacred purpose, as symbols of the body and blood of Christ, and have a blessing attached to their proper use? And what more do these passages intimate?

They do not, in the most remote way, hint at such a doctrine as that for which the Archdeacon has quoted them.

(4.) That *all* the recipients of the sacrament, the *wicked* as well as the faithful, receive the real Body and Blood of Christ. [5]

Upon his supposed proof that Augustine held this view, the Archdeacon appears more especially to rest his case for reckoning this Father as a supporter of his doctrine; for, in one place, after quoting a passage clearly opposed to his doctrine, he urges, that Augustine "*could not* mean to deny that the inward part is present by virtue of consecration, and that all communicants receive it, *because* he says in express words, that the Body and

[1] See pp. 250—254 above.

[2] Wilb. Doctr. of Euch. p. 292; or, 3rd ed. p. 251, and pp. 224, 225; or, 3rd ed. pp. 191, 192.

[3] Noster autem panis et calix . . . certa consecratione mysticus fit nobis, non nascitur. Proinde quod non ita fit, quamvis sit panis et calix, alimentum est refectionis, non sacramentum religionis. Aug. Cont. Faustum, xx. 13. vol. viii. p. 342. [ed. Antw. col. 243.] *I give the passage precisely as quoted by the Archdeacon.*

[4] Accedit verbum ad elementum et fit sacramentum. Id. In Joh. tract. lxxx. 3. Op. ed. cit. iii. pt. 2. col. 512.

[5] Wilb. Doctr. of Euch. pp. 119, *note*; 225; 292; 309; or, 3rd ed. pp. 101, *note*; 192; 250, 251; 266.

Blood of Christ are received even by those who do not profit by them."[1]

Augustine's doctrine on this point I have already endeavoured fully to place before the reader;[2] and have also carefully gone into the question how far the passages quoted from him by Archdeacon Wilberforce bear out the conclusion the Archdeacon has drawn from them.[3] I must therefore refer the reader to what I have there said.

(5.) That there is a real presence of the true Body and Blood of Christ in, or under the form of, the elements.[4]

In the chapter in which the Archdeacon undertakes to give the direct "testimony of antiquity to the doctrine of the Real Presence," among other Fathers he quotes Augustine; and his "testimony" from Augustine, besides what has been noticed in the two last-mentioned points, is to be found in the following passage:—

"It is in the writings of St. Augustin that these expressions [that is, the outward and inward part in the Holy Eucharist] assume a more definite shape. The outward part is called *sacramentum*, the inward *res* or *virtus sacramenti*. St. Augustin dwells upon the distinction with great variety of expression. It is 'one thing which is seen, and another which is understood' (Serm. 272, vol. v. 1104); 'the sacrament is one thing, and the virtue of the sacrament another' (In Joan. xxvi. 11. vol. iii. part 2. p. 498.); for there is 'that which is taken visibly in the sacrament, and that which is spiritually eaten and drunk.' (Serm. 131. vol. v. p. 641.) Hence there is such a thing as 'carnally and visibly pressing with the teeth the sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ,' and there is such a thing as 'spiritually eating the flesh of Christ and drinking his blood;' the '*sacramentum*,' that is, is one thing, the 'Body and Blood' another. (In Joan. xxvi. 18, vol. iii. pt. 2. p. 501.)"[5]

Now, what force these passages have for proving that Augustine held that the real Body and Blood of Christ are contained in or under, or under the form of, the bread and wine, I am quite unable to see. On the contrary, they seem rather to indicate that he considered the two things to be distinct

[1] p. 292. [2] See pp. 350—359 above. [3] See pp. 359—365 above.
[4] Wilb. Doctr. of Euch. pp. 290—293; or, 3rd ed. pp. 249—252.
[5] pp. 290, 291; or, p. 249.

and separate; and that he did so, I believe I have already given abundant proof,[1] and on that evidence am willing to let the case rest.

And here the Archdeacon makes the admission, that Augustine, in other parts of his writings, makes use of expressions not easily reconcileable with the doctrine he wishes to ascribe to him. But to what passages he refers, he does not distinctly state. He notices, however, two passages in his writings as needing explanation. The first is that in which Augustine says, that Judas "ate the bread of the Lord," while the other disciples "ate the bread [which is] the Lord."[2] And his explanation is, that Augustine "was only expressing the truth, that a *personal* relation to our Lord, who gives his body for our food in this sacrament, is not dependent on the mere partaking of that food, but is reserved for devout communicants;" in other words, that *worthy* reception is necessary to produce the intended *effect* of the participation. But this is no explanation of Augustine's words, because he speaks of that which Judas ate being *only* "the bread of the Lord;" while, according to the Archdeacon, Judas ate the Lord's real body as well as the disciples. The contrast in Augustine is between what Judas *ate* and what the other disciples *ate*, that is, between the *things eaten*, and not between the *effects* produced; while, according to the Archdeacon, the *things eaten* are *the same*.

The other is that in which Augustine says, that the sacrament is "given to some to life, to others to destruction," but that "the thing itself of which it is the sacrament is given to every man for life, to none for destruction, whoever may be a partaker of it."[3] And his only answer is, that Augustine *could not* mean to deny, that "all communicants receive" "the inward part," *because* he has said elsewhere that the Body and Blood of Christ are received by all. This, of course, is no answer; and the reason for denying the obvious and only possible meaning of the passage is, as I have shown, founded upon a mistake. Augustine did *not* hold, that the *real* Body and Blood of Christ are received by all.

(6.) That "the sacrament at large," i.e. what is received into the mouth of the communicant, is "an object of worship, because

[1] See pp. 250—254 above. [2] See p. 358 above. [3] See p. 354 above.

our Lord is contained in it;" the worship being, of course, intended only for the inward part.[1]

His first proof that this was the doctrine of Augustine is as follows:—

"This is explained by St. Augustin, who tells us that 'the symbols of Divine things are visible, but it is the invisible things themselves which are honoured in them. (De Catechis. Rud. sec. 50.)"

But the Archdeacon has yet to prove that the "*honor*" here alluded to was the honor of divine worship; and the words give not the least intimation that Augustine supposed the "invisible things" to be "*contained in*" the "visible symbols." And, as has happened before, if the Archdeacon had proceeded to quote the very next words, the meaning of Augustine would have been clear. For the words that follow are these: "and the matter that has been sanctified by the benediction *is not to be looked upon as it is looked upon when* APPLIED TO ORDINARY USES."[2] These words clearly show the *nature* of that qualified honor Augustine considers due to the consecrated things. When consecrated to serve the purposes of the Eucharist, the visible symbols are honored as things representing the Body and Blood of our Blessed and Divine Saviour, and as instrumental, in their right reception, for bringing us into communion with that Body and Blood. And the honor we pay to them is in fact paid to the invisible things they represent.

The next proof is, that Augustine says that Christ "walked on earth in his flesh, and gave his flesh itself to be eaten for our salvation; but no one eats that flesh who has not first worshipped." (In Psalm. xcviii. sec. 9.)

Now if we view this passage with the context, we shall see that there is no *particular* reference to the Eucharist in it. It occurs in Augustine's interpretation of the words, "worship the footstool of his feet" (Ps. xcviii. 5.), and he says that Scripture tells us that *the earth* is the footstool of his feet; and then he adds,—

"Doubtful what this means I turn to Christ, because I seek him here; and I find how without impiety the earth may be worshipped,

[1] WILB. Doctr. of Euch. pp. 303—306; or, 3rd ed. pp. 261—263.

[2] See the passage fully quoted p. 256 above.

the footstool of his feet may be worshipped without impiety. For he took upon him earth of the earth, because flesh is of the earth, and he took flesh of the flesh of Mary. And inasmuch as he walked on earth in the flesh itself, and gave the flesh itself to us to be eaten for salvation,—but no one eats that flesh, unless he has first worshipped it,—it is found in what way such a footstool of the Lord's feet may be worshipped; and not only do we not sin in worshipping, but we sin in not worshipping." [1]

There is no particular reference here to the Eucharist. And when Augustine says, that our Lord "walked on earth, &c. and gave his flesh to us to be eaten, &c.," he is evidently speaking generally of our Lord's incarnation and its consequences. And he justly says, that no one eats that flesh unless he has first worshipped it. For no one can enjoy real union and communion with the Saviour, who has not realized his true character, and worshipped the *incarnate* Saviour as his Lord and God. To affirm that Augustine was merely referring in these words to a (supposed) ecclesiastical custom of worshipping the Eucharistic substance as containing in it the flesh of Christ, before eating it, is to put a trifling sense on words that referred to an important truth.

And in the context Augustine shows clearly what he means by the phrase *eating* the flesh of Christ, as Bishop Andrews (a favorite referee of the party of the Authors under review, and actually quoted by the Archdeacon himself in this place[2] as supporting his view on the adoration due to the consecrated substances) long ago pointed out; and I shall give the argument in *his* words.

In his Answer to Cardinal Perron, who had referred to this passage of Augustine as sanctioning the adoration of the sacrament as containing, under the form of bread, the flesh of Christ,

[1] Fluctuans converto me ad Christum, quia ipsum quæro hic; et invenio quomodo sine impietate adoretur terra, sine impietate adoretur scabellum pedum ejus. Suscepit enim de terra terram: quia caro de terra est, et de carne Mariæ carnem accepit. Et quia in ipsa carne hic ambulavit, et ipsam carnem nobis manducandam ad salutem dedit; nemo autem illam carnem manducat, nisi prius adoraverit; inventum est quemadmodum adoratur tale scabellum pedum Domini, et non solum non peccemus adorando, sed peccemus non adorando. AUGUST. Enarr. in Psalm. xcviii. § 9. Op. iv. 799.—The Archdeacon, in a note, quotes the last words, "Non solum non peccemus," apparently, from the connexion, to lead the reader to suppose that Augustine considered that anyone would *sin* who did not *worship the sacrament*; for as quoted by him, they have no other reference.

[2] WILE. Doctr. of Euch. p. 298; or, 3rd ed. pp. 256, 257.

and by mistake had referred to Augustine's Commentary on the 96th (instead of the 98th) Psalm, Bishop Andrews says,—

"Augustine's place is mis-cited. Where it is truly cited, it showeth, the Cardinal hath very ill success in his citations. Upon the 96. Psalm, there is nothing to that purpose. But, upon the 98. Psalm, these words are, which, I dare say, he means: 'Nemo autem carnem illam manducat, nisi prius adoraverit;' which, I trust, no Christian man will ever refuse to do; that is, to adore the flesh of Christ. Wherein yet, lest any might mistake it with the Cardinal, with a wrong *Croyoit, come contenant le vraye et propre corps de Christ,* St. Augustine presently is careful to warn his auditors, that the word '*manducat*' there, is to be *spiritually understood,* and he bringeth in Christ thus speaking; *Non hoc corpus quod videtis manducaturi estis, et bibituri illum sanguinem, quem fusuri sunt, qui me crucifigent. Sacramentum aliquod vobis commendavi; spiritualiter intellectum vivificabit vos. Et si necesse est, illud visibiliter celebrari, oportet tamen invisibiliter intelligi.* [Ye are not to eat that body which ye see, and to drink that blood which they will pour out who will crucify me. I have delivered to you a certain sacrament (or, mystery); spiritually understood, it will give you life. And if it is necessary that it should be visibly celebrated, yet heed must be taken, that it be understood with reference to invisible things.] WHICH SHEW, THAT ST. AUGUSTINE WAS NOT OF THE CARDINAL'S 'CROYOIT' TOUCHING THE SACRAMENT." [1]

Now this applies equally to the doctrine of the Authors under review as to that of the Cardinal, for the Cardinal no more supposed a *material* presence of Christ's body than they do. The only difference is, that one supposes that the substance of the bread remains, and the other that it is gone; which does not affect the question of the adoration of the consecrated thing. For whether the Body of Christ is present in the consecrated substance by union with the bread or by substitution for the substance of the bread, adoration is equally due to the consecrated substance under either supposition.

One quotation more is given by the Archdeacon from Augustine on this point. He tells us that Augustine (ep. cxl. sec. 66.) says, that the wicked come to Christ's Table and wor-

[1] BISHOP ANDREWS'S Opusc. Post. 1629. 4to. Answer to Perron's Reply, p. 4.

ship, though they are not profited by the gift of his body. I have already given the passage in a former page.[1]

Now there is no question that they who come to Christ's Table worship there Christ incarnate; but what the Archdeacon has got to prove is, that the persons here spoken of worshipped *the things lying on the Table*, which he can never get out of the words of Augustine.

(7.) That the real presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Eucharistic elements is taught by the 6th chapter of St. John.[2]

The argument on this point I have already considered, and therefore refer the reader to what I have there said on the subject.[3]

(8.) That our Lord, when he administered the Eucharist to his disciples at his Last Supper, carried his *real* body in his own hands.[4]

In proof of this, the Archdeacon quotes the following passage from Augustine:—

"Who is carried in his own hands? In the hands of others a man can be carried, but not in his own. How this could be understood literally of David we do not find: but how it can be understood of Christ, we do find. For Christ was carried in his own hands, when, commending his own Body, he said, This is my Body. For he bore that Body in his own hands."[5]

The quotation is perfectly correct, and the translation fairly represents the words of Augustine. But surely, even without going further, the symbolical character of what our Lord held in his hands would be sufficient to indicate a sense of the words more reasonable than that our Lord, when his body was sitting at the table with his disciples, also held his body in his hands, and multiplied it so as to give it twelve times! And when we find Augustine distinctly saying elsewhere (to quote no other passage), "The Lord doubted not to say, 'This is my Body,'

[1] See p. 360 above.

[2] Wilb. Doctr. of Euch. p. 207; or, 3rd ed. p. 177.

[3] See pp. 120—123 above.

[4] Wilb. Doctr. of Euch. p. 64; or, 3rd ed. p. 54.

[5] August. in Psalm xxxiii. Enarr. i. § 10. Op. ed. cit. iv. 160.

[6] See p. 70 above. And for others see pp. 261—263.

when he was giving *a sign* of his Body,"[6] we can find little difficulty in understanding what he means by the above passage.

But the truth is, that, in the context itself, he himself qualifies the words so as to show what his real meaning is. For he there says,—

"How was he borne in his own hands? Because when he commended [or rather, delivered] his own body and blood, he took into his hands what the faithful know, and he himself *in a certain manner* (*quodam modo*) carried himself, when he said, 'This is my Body.'"[1]

And in the very *same* discourse he tells us, that it is the peculiar characteristic of a sacrament, *that one thing should be called by the name of another thing signified by it.*[2]

The sense in which this phrase, "*in a certain manner*," (quodam modo) is used by Augustine, may be illustrated by another passage from his writings, where he says,—

"Those whom we gain for the Lord, the Church in a certain way eats. What is 'eats'? Passes into its body. For whatever we eat, we pass into our body. This the Church does by the saints. It hungers for those whom it wishes to gain; and whom it hath in some way gained, it in a certain way eats."[3]

And in fact, as we have already seen,[4] Augustine himself, while he speaks here of our Lord in a certain way carrying his body in his hands, in another passage speaks of "*the bread* which our Lord carried in his hands."

(9.) That "our Lord's human body is the medium through which his relation to mankind is brought about."

"Such," says the Archdeacon,[5] "is St. Augustine's state-

[1] Quomodo ferebatur in manibus suis? Quia cum commendaret ipsum corpus suum et sanguinem suum, accepit in manus suas quod norunt fideles, et ipse se portabat quodam modo, cum diceret, Hoc est corpus meum. ID. ib. Enarr. ii. § 2. col. 161.

[2] See p. 248 above.

[3] Eos quos Domino lucramur, quodammodo manducat Ecclesia. Quid est manducat? In corpus suum trajicit. Quidquid enim manducamus, in corpus nostrum trajicimus. Hoc agit Ecclesia per sanctos. Esurit quos lucrari vult, et quos lucrata fuerit aliquo modo, manducat quodammodo. AUGUST. In Psalm. xxx. Enarr. iii. § 5. Op. iv. 117. A similar use of the phrase occurs in the same discourse, § 9. col. 119. in the words, Quid est enim hærere cornibus, nisi quodam modo crucifigi.

[4] See p. 236 above.

[5] WILB. Doctr. of Euch. pp. 261, 262; or, 3rd ed. p. 224.

" ment, when he compares our Lord's gift of his Body in the " Holy Eucharist to the manner in which the food which an in- " fant is unable to digest is prepared for it by becoming 'incar- " nate' in its mother's milk. (In Psalm. xxx. Enarr. i. 6.)"

Now Augustine draws no such comparison. He says not a word about the Eucharist in the place to which the Archdeacon refers, but speaks only of Christ's incarnation. The words that follow those to which the Archdeacon alludes are these,—

"How, therefore, did the Wisdom of God feed us from that very bread? Because the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us."[1]

That there is a sense in which the proposition of the Archdeacon is true, and a sense in which it might be said that our Lord gives his Body to us in the Eucharist, i. e. in the Eucharistic rite, as a mother nourishes her child with her milk, is perfectly true and capable of proof from Augustine; though that sense is not what the Archdeacon would affix to the words. But certainly the passage here quoted from Augustine does not at all bear out the conclusion drawn from it by the Archdeacon.

(10.) That St. Augustine asserts our Lord's Presence in the Holy Eucharist to depend upon the presence of his Body.[2]

His proof is supplied in a note, where he gives St. Augustine's words precisely as follows:—

"Corpus Christi .... illud, quod ex fructibus terræ acceptum, et prece mystica consecratum .... non sanctificatur ut sit tam magnum sacramentum, nisi operante invisibiliter Spiritu Dei. De Trinitate iii. 10."

Now if the words "Body of Christ," in this passage, meant the real Body of Christ, as Archdeacon Wilberforce here represents, it would follow from this passage, as quoted by the Archdeacon, that the real Body of Christ was made of the fruits of the earth, and needed sanctification by the Holy Spirit to fit it to serve the purposes of a Sacrament!

But, in fact, a passage more opposed to the doctrine of the Archdeacon could not have been quoted. The passage, *as it stands in Augustine*, will be found in p. 433 above, and to it, as

[1] Quomodo ergo de ipso pane pavit nos Sapientia Dei? Quia Verbum caro factum est, et habitavit in nobis. AUG. In Psalm. xxxiii. Enarr. i. 6. iv. 158.

[2] WILB. Doctr. of Euch. p. 268; or, 3rd ed. p. 230.

there given, I would refer the reader; for it needs no remark to show him its real bearing upon the doctrine now in question.

This is *the whole* of the evidence adduced by the Archdeacon in support of his doctrine from Augustine. What may be its value, the reader must judge for himself.

I should add, that he professes, in one part of his work, to show that the passages alleged from the Fathers, and among others from Augustine, to prove that there is only a symbolical presence of Christ's body and blood in the consecrated elements, are insufficient for the purpose. The numerous passages above cited from Augustine, bearing on this point, will be fresh in the recollection of the reader. But of all these, two brief sentences only are noticed by the Archdeacon as follows.

He tells us that Augustine "accounts for the fact, that the "names given to the outward and inward parts in a sacrament "are interchangeable, by saying that it is because the two are "in some sense identical. . . . . This is St. Augustine's state- "ment, then, in his celebrated letter to Boniface: 'as the sacra- "ment of the Body of Christ is in a certain sense Christ's Body, "and the Sacrament of the Blood of Christ is Christ's Blood; "so the sacrament of faith is faith.'"[1]

But Augustine says not a word about the names of the outward and inward parts being *interchangeable*. And the force of his language in this passage, in reply to the Archdeacon's doctrine, is in the statement, that the sacrament is "*in a certain sense* Christ's Body," (which *sense* the context shows to be, *by similitude*,) whereas the Archdeacon says, that the sacrament is the sacrament and Christ's real body joined together.

And he adds, that when Augustine "affirms that 'sacraments "would not be sacraments if they had not some likeness to the "things of which they were sacraments'—this is merely an asser- "tion, that Almighty God would not have selected the outward "signs which He has been pleased to associate with inward "gifts, unless there had been a congruity between the sign and "the thing signified."[2]

But I must contend that it asserts much more than this. It shows that he considered the sacraments not to consist of sacra-

[1] Wilb. Doctr. of Euch. p. 240; or, 3rd ed. pp. 205, 206. For the passage of Augustine, see p. 241 above. [2] Id. ibid. p. 241; or, 3rd ed. 206.

ments and the things of which they are sacraments joined together, but to be representations of the things of which they are sacraments. For he is not here using the word *sacraments* to denote the *rite*, but *the things* used in the rite. The word sacrament is used respecting both. And when we are speaking of *the rite* called *sacramentum*, it may be correctly said that it properly consists of the *sacramentum* and the *res sacramenti*, because in that case the word *sacramentum* is understood to be used in two different senses; but when speaking of the *thing* used in the sacramental rite, it is a contradiction in terms to talk of the *sacramentum* as compounded of the *sacramentum* and the *res sacramenti*; for it is equivalent to saying, that a thing is compounded of itself and something else joined together.

What is Augustine's real doctrine on this point, has been already pointed out.[1]

While considering the testimony of Augustine, it may be well to notice the slight references made to his writings by Archdeacon Denison. Of all the Fathers he is the only one to whom Archdeacon Denison makes any particular allusion; and the points on which he refers to him are these.

"That Augustine," he says, "ever held or taught that the "sacraments, as received by those receiving unworthily, are *dif-* "*ferent things* from the sacraments as received by those re- "ceiving worthily, no man can maintain who will examine his "works."[2]

I quite agree with him. The things received into the mouths of the communicants,—which is what the Archdeacon is here referring to under the term *sacraments*,—are, according to St. Augustine, *the same* in all cases, whether the communicants are good or bad; and therefore on that point I need add no more. But as he seems to wish to intimate that Augustine held (to use his own phraseology) that the *sacramentum* and the *res sacramenti* are so joined together as to form one compound whole, I would refer him to the proofs given above[3] of Augustine's real views on this point.

[1] See pp. 253, 254, and 255—257, and 261, 262 above.

[2] Denison's Serm. ii. p. 115, or, 3rd ed. p. 77.

[3] See pp. 251—255 above.

Archdeacon Denison maintains also (though without quoting any passages in proof of the statement) that,—

"St. Augustine held, as is abundantly plain from many passages in his writings, that the 'res sacramenti,' the inward part or thing signified—the Body and Blood of Christ—is received by *all* communicants." [1]

The reply to this the reader will find very fully given in the second section of this chapter.[2]

One more assertion the Archdeacon ventures to make with respect to Augustine, namely, that "it is not the necessary, nor yet the primary and natural interpretation" of the words of St. Augustine in his Commentary on John vi. 56, quoted in our 29th Article, "that the unbelieving communicant does not receive the Body and Blood of Christ, 'the inward part or thing signified' of the Blessed Sacrament;" which assertion he seems principally to rest upon the fact that these words were inserted by Thomas Aquinas, in 1255, in the Service for the Feast of Corpus Christi.[3]

On the meaning and true reading of this passage, I beg to refer the reader to the remarks I have already made respecting them.[4] As it respects the quotation from it made in our 29th Article (which Archdeacon Denison notices in the Appendix to his second Sermon as testifying in his favor as it respects the views of the framers of our Articles) I shall speak when considering the testimony of that Article on our present subject.

Augustine is also of course referred to by Dr. Pusey; and were we to judge by a hasty glance at Dr. Pusey's extracts from the Fathers on the subject, we might suppose that nearly fifty pages could be filled with passages from Augustine maintaining the doctrine of the real presence of our Lord's natural Body and Blood, in a supernatural form, in or with or under the Bread and Wine.

But so far are these passages from asserting such a doctrine, that a considerable portion of them are *directly opposed to it,*

[1] Serm. ii. p. 123: or, 3rd ed. pp. 83, 84. [2] See pp. 350—365 above.
[3] Serm. iii. pp. 162—164; or, 3rd. ed. pp. 110—112.
[4] See pp. 355—358 above.

and many others contain not the slightest evidence in its favor. In fact, they are nothing but a miscellaneous collection of passages from each of the volumes of Augustine's Works in which something is said about the Eucharist.

As a proof how completely some of the passages quoted testify *against* Dr. Pusey's doctrine, I will here place before the reader one which I have not before given, and which I derive from Dr. Pusey's notice of it. It is cited by him from among the sermons attributed to Augustine, recently published by Cardinal Mai.[1]

"He [Christ] came in the flesh, that men might eat him; and he remained entire with the Father, that he might feed angels..... *When Christ was made man, man did eat angels' food.* Whence? How? In what way? By what merits? By right of what dignity would man eat angels' Bread, unless the Creator of angels had *become man? . . . What is to eat Christ? It is not only to receive his Body in the Sacrament.* For many unworthy receive, of whom saith the Apostle, 'Whoso eateth the Bread and drinketh the cup of the Lord unworthily, eateth and drinketh judgment to himself.' But how is Christ to be *eaten?* How, he himself says; 'He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, abideth in me and I in him.' *If he abideth in me, and I in him, then he eateth, then he drinketh. But he that abideth not in me, nor I in him, although he receive the sacrament, he getteth great torment.* What, then, 'he that abideth in me' means, Himself says in another place: 'He that keepeth my commandments, abideth in me and I in him.'"[2]

Here it is distinctly stated, first, that the eating of Christ is the immediate consequence of the *incarnation;* for it is said that—"when Christ was made man, man did eat angels' food:" and, secondly, that it is not by only receiving Christ's Body *in the sacrament,* that is, his *sacramental Body,* that we "*eat Christ,*" but by abiding in Christ as one who keeps his commandments. The words necessarily mean his *sacramental Body,* because otherwise all would "*eat Christ,*" (which Augustine here denies) though they might not all do so *worthily* and with effect.

Of those which might seem to the general reader to bear a favorable aspect towards the doctrine here opposed, the greater number consist of passages in which the sole evidence is

[1] Mai, Biblioth. Nov. Patr. tom. i. serm. 129. p. 303.

[2] Pusey, loc. cit. p. 542.

supplied from the fact that the consecrated elements are called the Body and Blood of Christ. But this fact, as I have so frequently stated, no one disputes. And when Augustine himself expressly says, that the *signs* were ordinarily called by *the names of the things signified*, and gives the reason why they were so called, it is really trifling with the reader to cite a number of passages from him in which such phraseology occurs, to prove that he maintained, that the signs were actually *turned into* or *contained* the things signified.

For instance, Dr. Pusey quotes Augustine as saying, with reference to the custom of receiving the sacrament fasting, that it seemed good to the Holy Spirit, "that for the honour of so "great a sacrament, the Lord's Body should enter the mouth "of a Christian previously to other food." (Ep. 54, ad Januar. §§ 7, 8.) [1]

Precisely the same language we have seen used by Isidore of Seville, and to be immediately followed by these words,— "Bread, inasmuch as it strengthens the body, is therefore called "the Body of Christ; but wine, inasmuch as it produces blood "in the flesh, is therefore referred to the Blood of Christ." [2]

Inattention to this fact has led to a total misconception of the general phraseology of the Fathers.

Again, several of Dr. Pusey's quotations are of this kind:—

"Until they drank the blood they had shed, they despaired of their own salvation." [3]——"There believed of them many: the Blood of Christ was given them, more to drink it for their deliverance, than to be held guilty for shedding it: who can despair?" [4]

But, as we have just seen,[5] Augustine expressly represents our Lord as warning those to whom he spake of eating his flesh and drinking his blood, that they were not to suppose he meant their literally eating the Body they saw, or drinking the blood that was to be shed upon the Cross, but that his language was to be *spiritually understood*.

And, as it not unfrequently happens in these quotations of Dr. Pusey from the Fathers, the very next passage explains what is meant, and *turns the meaning directly against Dr. Pusey's*

[1] Pusey's Notes, &c. p. 505.
[2] See p. 242 above.
[3] p. 514. From Aug. Comm. in Joh. hom. [tract.] xxxi. § 9.
[4] Ib. From hom. [tract.] xxxviii. § 7.
[5] See p. 509 above.

*doctrine.* For it stands thus:—"The Blood which in their raging they had shed, BELIEVING THEY DRANK."[1] That is, they drank his Blood by an act of faith. And the words in the original express this more emphatically. For their literal translation is this:—"The Blood which in their raging they had shed, IN BELIEVING THEY DRANK."[2] And it must be observed that these words refer to an *act of faith entirely independent of the reception of the Eucharist,* for there is no allusion to the Eucharist in the passage. A stronger testimony *against* Dr. Pusey's doctrine could hardly be conceived.

Dr. Pusey quotes another passage from one of Augustine's Sermons (Serm. lxxvii. § 4.), in which the same doctrine is expressed in almost the same words, but, in this case, in connexion with the Lord's Supper. He gives the passage thus:—

"They came to the Lord's Table, and in faith drank that Blood, which in their fury they had shed."[3]

Here again, if the drinking is to be understood as a literal drinking, then we must recollect Augustine's own statement that it was not that Blood that was shed upon the Cross that was so drunk; for that when our Lord spoke of our drinking his Blood, he was speaking in language to be spiritually understood.

But Augustine was far more probably speaking here of that spiritual act of drinking the Blood of Christ by faith, while receiving the sacramental symbol of it, to which his words in the last quotation evidently and necessarily referred. And his words might more correctly be translated thus:—

"They came to the Lord's Table, and the blood which raging they shed, *believing* they drank."[4]

These words exactly represent the doctrine for which I contend. According to Dr. Pusey, when they "came to the Lord's Table," they drank that blood, *whether they believed or not.* But not so according to Augustine.

Of the remaining passages having any show of weight in favor of Dr. Pusey's doctrine, the principal are of course those

[1] PUSEY, Notes, &c. p. 514. From AUG. in Joh. hom. [tract.] xl. § 2.

[2] Quem sanguinem sæviendo fuderunt, credendo biberunt. AUG. In Joh. tract. xl. § 2. Op. iii. pt. 2. col. 410.

[3] PUSEY, Notes, &c. p. 525.

[4] Ad mensam Domini accesserunt, et sanguinem quem sævientes fuderunt, credentes biberunt. AUGUST. Serm. lxxvii. § 4. Op. v. 394.

which are quoted by Archdeacon Wilberforce, and have been already considered. The others are of a similar kind, and to be interpreted in a similar way. To go through them all would be only to weary the reader, and unnecessarily enlarge this volume. But I will notice two or three that are the most likely to create a difficulty.

"We also feed on the Lord's Cross, since we eat his Body." [1]

But here the form of expression itself shows, that it is on the Lord's Body *as hanging on the Cross*, that we feed, and therefore that the feeding referred to must necessarily be only of a spiritual kind by faith.

A similar explanation removes the difficulty in the following passage:—

"He says that the Sheep hath given place to the Bread; as though ignorant that both formerly Shewbread was wont to be placed on the Table of the Lord, and that now he himself receives a *portion from the Body* of the Lamb without spot. He says that 'the Blood hath given place to the Cup;' not reflecting that even now he receives the Blood in the Cup." [2]

But is our Lord's *real body* divided into *portions*, to be distributed to the communicants? No; this language applies only to the sign which represents his body. And consequently the language used in this passage is sacramental language, speaking, as usual, of the signs by the names of the things signified by them.

Again, Dr. Pusey quotes the following:—

"The Lord himself endureth Judas, a devil, a thief, and his betrayer: he allows him to receive, among the innocent disciples, what the faithful know to be our ransom." [3]

But, not now to insist upon all the passages already quoted showing that Augustine did *not* think that wicked men received the true body and blood of Christ in the Eucharist,[4] Augustine himself, as we have seen, draws a distinction between what Judas received and what the other disciples received.[5]

[1] Pusey, p. 523. From August. in Ps. [c.] ci. n. 9.

[2] Ib. pp. 502, 503. From Epist. 36. ad Casulan. § 24.

[3] Pusey, Notes, &c., p. 503. The extract is from Aug. Ep. 43. ad Glor. Eleus. &c. § 23.

[4] See pp. 350 et seq. above.

[5] See p. 358 above.

The passage, therefore, must be understood, in consistency with the other statements made by Augustine on the subject, as speaking in *sacramental* language.[1] As the bread and wine were called the Body and Blood of Christ, so might they with equal propriety be called "our ransom." And the object of Augustine's argument, in the passage, would be better served by the stronger term.

The case is the same with another passage, cited by Dr. Pusey as follows:—

"To be made a partaker of that Table, is to begin to have life; for in Ecclesiastes, 'it is not good for a man, save that he should eat and drink,' what can he be more probably thought to mean, than what appertains to the participation of this Table, which the Priest himself, the Mediator of the New Testament, exhibits after the order of Melchizedek, of his own Body and Blood. For this sacrifice succeeded all those sacrifices of the Old Testament, which were immolated as a shadow of that to come, of which we understand that voice of the same Mediator speaking, through the prophecy in the 39th Psalm, 'Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a body hast thou prepared for me;' because for all those sacrifices and oblations his Body is offered, and is ministered to the communicants."[2]

The point of this passage is of course in the words, that Christ's Body "is ministered to the communicants." But Dr. Pusey should have qouted the words just preceding this passage, in which it is distinctly stated of the Table here spoken of, that our Lord "prepared the Table with *bread and wine*;"[3] which shows at once how the subsequent words are to be understood, namely, in a sacramental sense; the bread and wine being considered and called his Body and Blood as effectively representing them.

And all these passages must be viewed in connexion with that host of passages, quoted in the second section of this

[1] The passage stands thus:—Tolerat ipse Dominus Judam, diabolum, furem et venditorem suum: sinit accipere inter innocentes discipulos, quod fideles noverunt pretium nostrum. AUGUST. Ep. ad Glor. et Eleus., &c. ep. 43. § 23. Op. ii. 75.

[2] PUSEY, Notes, &c. pp. 531, 532. The passage is from AUG. De Civ. Dei. xvii. 20.

[3] Mensam in vino et panibus præparasse. AUG. De Civ. Dei, xvii. 20. Op. vii. 366.

chapter from Augustine, showing his real doctrine on this subject.

To distinguish his doctrine, however, from that of Rome, Dr. Pusey points out that Augustine says, that "we receive the Body and Blood of our Lord *in* or *under* the elements,"[1] and that this means, that there is a real presence of the natural Body and Blood of Christ, in a supernatural way, "under that outward veil;"[2] that is, in or under the substance of the bread and wine, but not, as the Romanists maintain, substituted for it.

And to bring this presence within the bounds of possibility, he tells us, that "the term 'in' as used by the Fathers does not express any 'local' inclusion of the Body and Blood of Christ; it denotes their presence there after the manner of a sacrament," and that "the presence of our Lord's Body and Blood in the Holy Eucharist is in a supernatural, Divine, ineffable way, not subject to the laws of natural bodies."[3]

Now I quite agree with Dr. Pusey, that the word "in" "denotes their presence there, after the manner of a sacrament;" but the very question at issue is, what "the manner of a sacrament" *is*. And the supposition of such a presence as that maintained by Dr. Pusey, that is, that the real, natural Body of Christ should be present in the bread, but not *locally* present, and in a way "not subject to the laws of natural bodies," is entirely opposed to the statements of the Fathers, and especially of Augustine, as has been already shown.[4] For they say, that our Lord's risen body is still circumscribed, and can only be in one place at one time, and therefore *is*, so far, "subject to the laws of natural bodies." Augustine, therefore, could not have used the word "in" in the sense here attributed to it by Dr. Pusey.

The passages quoted from Augustine by Dr. Pusey on this point are the two following. One is this:—

"Receive ye that in the Bread which hung on the Cross; receive ye that in the Cup which flowed from the side."[5]

Now we have just seen,[6] that Augustine expressly maintained, that we do *not* really receive orally that Body which hung on

[1] Pusey, Notes, &c. p. 498. [2] Ibid. p. 132. [3] Ibid. pp. 131, 132.
[4] See pp. 309—316 above. [5] Pusey, Notes, &c. p. 132. [6] See p. 509 above.

the Cross, or that Blood which was there poured forth. And therefore it is clear that these words are not to be taken in their literal sense. And the meaning of the word "in" may be best understood from Augustine's own use of it in another passage, where he speaks of the Body of Christ received in the Eucharist as being his mystical Body composed of the company of the faithful, and says *in like terms*,—"We also are made "his body, and by his mercy we are what we receive.... Ye "are now come in the name of Christ as to the cup of the "Lord; and there *ye are on the table*, and there *ye are* IN THE "CUP."[1]

But Dr. Pusey will not, I suppose, affirm that Augustine meant that the bodies of the faithful were really on the table, and their blood really in the cup, in some supernatural way.

The other passage is this:—

"Our Lord Jesus Christ commended his Body and Blood *in* [Dr. Pusey's italics] those things which are, out of many, reduced into some one."[2]

Now this passage must have been quoted without any reference to the context, for this is one of those passages in which Augustine represents the things eaten and drunk to be the mystical body of Christ. For in the context he says,—"In "this meat and drink, that is, the body and blood of Christ, it "is not so. For both he who does not take it has not life, and "he who takes it has life, and that eternal life. Therefore *by* "*this meat and drink he wishes to be understood the society of his* "*body and members, which is the holy Church*.... 'For my flesh,' "he says, 'is truly meat, and my blood is truly drink.' For "since the object of men in taking meat and drink is, that they "may not hunger nor thirst, this is not really supplied except "by that meat and drink which makes those by whom it is "taken immortal and incorruptible; *that is, by the society* "*itself of the saints*, where there will be peace and unity full "and perfect." And then he immediately adds,—"*On that* "*account truly*, as men of God before us have understood it, "our Lord Jesus Christ commended his Body and Blood in

[1] See p. 290 above; and see the other passages quoted in pp. 288—290.

[2] PUSEY'S Serm. p. 40. The passage is from AUG. Comm. in Johan. tract. 26. n. 17.

"those things which are, out of many, reduced to some one. "For one of those things is made into one out of many grains, "and the other flows together into one out of many grapes."[1]

So that Augustine here represents the Body and Blood as being the society of the faithful (as he does in other passages already quoted[2]), and says that they were commended, or delivered, by our Lord in bread and wine, because bread and wine suitably represented the multitude of believers united together into one body. Dr. Pusey's interpretation of the passage, therefore, falls at once, when we view it with the context; for he himself, I suppose, would not maintain, that the society of the faithful were inside the bread and wine.

The argument against Dr. Pusey's doctrine, derived from Augustine's use of the words "figure," "sign," &c., with reference to the consecrated things, Dr. Pusey summarily disposes of[3] by the *assertion*, that these terms refer to "the outward elements," as distinguished from "the inward part," which he holds to be so joined with them as to form *part* of that which is received into the mouth of the communicant. But the obvious reply is, that Augustine uses these terms to describe that which is received into the mouth of the communicant, and therefore does *not* limit their meaning to *part only* of what is so received.

With respect also to the use of the word "spiritually" in this subject by Augustine, and other Fathers, Dr. Pusey maintains that they used it as opposed, "not to really and sacramentally, but to physically and carnally." And he quotes the

[1] In hoc vero cibo et potu, id est, corpore et sanguine Domini, non ita est. Nam et qui eam non sumit, non habet vitam: et qui eam sumit, habet vitam, et hanc utique æternam. Hunc itaque cibum et potum societatem vult intelligi corporis et membrorum suorum, quod est sancta Ecclesia.... 'Caro enim mea,' inquit, 'vere est cibus, et sanguis meus vere est potus.' Cum enim cibo et potu id appetant homines, ut non esuriant, neque sitiant; hoc veraciter non præstat nisi iste cibus et potus, qui eos a quibus sumitur, immortales et incorruptibiles facit, id est, societas ipsa sanctorum, ubi pax erit et unitas plena et perfecta. Propterea quippe, sicut etiam ante nos hoc intellexerunt homines Dei, Dominus noster Jesus Christus corpus et sanguinem suum in eis rebus commendavit, quæ ad unum aliquid rediguntur ex multis. Namque aliud in unum ex multis granis confit; aliud in unum ex multis acinis confluit. Aug. Comm. in Joh. tract. xxvi. 15, 17. Op. iii. pt. 2. col. 362.

[2] See pp. 288—290 above.

[3] Notes, &c. pp. 107, 108, and 498.

following passage in proof:—"Eat life, drink life; thou shalt "have life, and the life is entire. But then shall the Body and "the Blood of Christ be each man's life, if what is taken in "the Sacrament visibly is, in the truth itself, eaten spiritually, "drunk spiritually."[1]

A passage more opposed to Dr. Pusey's notions could hardly be penned. Certainly the word "spiritually" is not opposed to "really," if "really" be understood to mean a real act of the soul, by which the true Body of Christ is spiritually eaten; but it certainly *is* opposed to it, if "really" is understood to mean an eating of the real body of Christ by the mouth. And it is clearly opposed to, or rather distinguished from, "sacramentally" in the very passage here quoted; not to mention many other passages of Augustine. For Augustine here manifestly distinguishes between the Body and Blood of Christ being taken visibly in the Sacrament, and being "in the truth itself" of that Body and Blood "eaten spiritually, drunk spiritually;" *i. e.*, between the reception by the mouth of the visible sacramental Body and Blood, and the spiritual eating and drinking by the soul of the real Body and Blood. And the words of Augustine preceding those quoted by Dr. Pusey, clearly point to the same doctrine, being as follows:—"Cer-"tainly he who could ascend whole, could not be consumed. "Therefore he gave us a salutary refection of his Body and "Blood, and briefly solves so important a question respecting "his entireness. Therefore let those who eat, eat; and those "who drink, drink; [*i. e.* let those who eat and drink the "Sacrament with the mouth, eat and drink with the spirit that "which the Sacrament represents;] let them hunger and "thirst; let them eat life, let them drink life. That eating is, "to be refreshed; and you shall so be refreshed, that that from "which you have been refreshed does not fail. That drinking, "what is it but life? Eat life, drink life," &c.[2]

[1] Pusey, Serm. pp. 41, 42. The quotation is from Aug. Serm. 131. § 1.

[2] Certe qui integer adscendere potuit, consumi non potuit. Ergo et de corpore ac sanguine suo dedit nobis salubrem refectionem, et tam magnam breviter solvit de sua integritate quæstionem. Manducent ergo qui manducant, et bibant qui bibunt; esuriant et sitiant: vitam manducent, vitam bibant. Illud manducare, refici est: sed sic reficeris, ut non deficiat unde reficeris. Illud bibere, quid est nisi vivere? Manduca vitam, bibe vitam: habebis vitam, et integra est vita-

And what this spiritual eating is, according to Augustine, may be judged from what he says of Mary, who sat at the feet of Jesus and heard his words. "Whence," he says, "was "Mary delighted? What did she eat? I dwell upon any- "thing because I am delighted. I venture to say, *she ate him* "*whom she heard.* For if she ate the truth, has not he said, "'I am the truth?' And what more shall I say? He was "eaten, because he was bread. 'I am,' he says, 'the bread "that came down from heaven.' That is the bread which "refreshes, and does not fail."[1]

### Chrysostom. (fl. a. 398.)

The next writer whose statements respecting the Lord's Supper I purpose considering is Chrysostom — an author whose fervid imagination and unrestrained vehemence of language require peculiar care to distinguish his real doctrine on any subject from that which might be affixed to his words. More than most of the Fathers (though few indeed of them were free from the tendency) he delighted in throwing an air of mystic grandeur over the doctrines and rites of the Christian faith. All were described in the language of hyperbole, and characterized as mysteries of the highest order. Even the simple rite of Baptism is described, as we have seen,[2] as "those sacred and awful (*φρικτοῖς*) mysteries," and the words used in it as those "mystic and fearful (*μυστικῶν καὶ φοβερῶν*) words, and the dreadful (*φρικτοὺς*) rules of the doctrines brought down from heaven."

Notwithstanding, therefore, the advantages derived by the Romanists from the hyperbolical phrases of Chrysostom on these subjects, they themselves are obliged to admit, that his

Tunc autem hoc erit, id est, vita unicuique erit corpus et sanguis Christi, si quod in sacramento visibiliter sumitur, in ipsa veritate spiritaliter manducetur, spiritaliter bibatur. August. Serm. cxxxi. § 1. Op. v. 446, 447. A portion of this passage has been already quoted in p. 359, above.

[1] Unde Maria delectabatur? quid manducabat? Immoror quia delector. Audeo dicere, ipsum manducabat quem audiebat. Si enim veritatem manducabat, nonne ipse dixit, Ego sum veritas? Et quid amplius dicam? Manducabatur quia panis erat. Ego sum, inquit, panis qui de cœlo descendi. Iste panis est qui reficit, nec deficit. Aug. Serm. clxxix. § 5. Op. v. 595, 596.

[2] See p. 391 above.

words are often not to be understood in the sense which the first view of them would induce us to give them.[1]

It is obvious that with such a writer great care is necessary to avoid being mislead, by such language, to ascribe to him doctrines which a review and comparison of his words, especially in his more sober statements, would show that he did not maintain.

Now, the passages already quoted from him, may serve to a great extent to guide our judgment as to the meaning of those that are adduced out of his writings in favor of the doctrine of the Authors under review.

Let us bear in mind, then, that he says, that what our Lord "gave" to his disciples at his Last Supper was "wine,"[2] and that "the *bread*" in the Holy Communion is "the Body of Christ,"[3] and that he called the *wine*, the Blood of Christ;[4] and that he spoke of "the consecrated elements" as the "*symbols*" of his Body and Blood.[5] And in a work attributed to him, and admitted to be a work of considerable value, we find the author expressly saying of the Eucharistic vessels,—"In which there is *not the true body of Christ*, but the mystery of his body is contained."[6] Moreover, instead of speaking of Christ's real body, as now living and glorified, as being present in an immaterial form on the Table, he everywhere speaks of Christ "lying before us slain," as "a lamb slain and crucified;" and of his blood as "emptied into the cup from his immaculate side,"—expressions clearly and necessarily implying only a symbolical presence;[7] and he contrasts his "presence" with "the mysteries" in a way inconsistent with the notion that he supposed his real substantial presence, even in an immaterial form (if that were possible), to be vouchsafed in the mysteries.[8] He exhorts us also, that our minds should be raised to heaven when

[1] Thus, for instance, Sixtus Senensis, speaking of a passage from Crysostom, says,—"Adversus hujusmodi errores meminisse oportet, quod et alibi sæpe monuimus, non esse concionatorum verba semper eo rigore accipienda, quo primum ad aures auditorum perveniunt. Multa enim declamatores per hyperbolem crebro enunciant et inculcant, vel occasione locorum temporum ac personarum adducti, vel affectuum impetu et orationis cursu rapti. Hoc interdum Chrysostomo contigit." Biblioth. Sanct. lib. vi. annot. 152. ed. Venet. 1566. p. 779.

[2] See p. 236 above. [3] See p. 238 above. [4] See p. 244 above.

[5] See several passages in pp. 271, 272 above. [6] See p. 272 above.

[7] See p. 282 above. [8] See p. 305 above.

partaking of the Eucharist, and that "we have our victim above, our priest above, our sacrifice above;"[1] all which is totally inconsistent with the notion that the real body of Christ, our victim and sacrifice, is actually lying on the Table before us. He tells us also, that the Body of Christ does not nourish the body but the soul,[2] and that "he that hath partaken of this food will be beyond the power of death;"[3] which is irreconcileable with the notion that the Body of Christ is so joined to the bread that *all* the communicants, the wicked as well as the faithful, partake of it. He speaks also of our being made concorporal with Christ *by faith*,[4] and that we are made "of his flesh and of his bones," and "mingled with his body," *by Baptism*;[5]—showing that he held what he and other Fathers called the commingling of our bodies with Christ's, to be entirely a spiritual act. Moreover, when he says that "Baptism is nothing else than the *death* of the baptized and his *resurrection*,"[6] we may expect that his language respecting the other sacrament will be of a similar character, calling it by the name of that which it represents. Against the doctrine of Transubstantiation his testimony is clear and express.[7] And though he in some passages uses terms which might seem to imply, that the elements themselves in the Eucharist imbibe through consecration a Divine power and efficacy, yet, not only is this language opposed to the notion of a real presence of the body of Christ in the elements, but, as he uses the same language respecting the water of Baptism, there is every reason to suppose that he means the same in one case as in the other.[8] Most distinctly also does he state, that in the Eucharist we take hold of Christ by faith when he is sitting above with the Father, and that the body of which we are to partake is now in Heaven, and that we are to rise there in spirit to be made partakers of it.[9] And he frequently speaks of the acts of the soul in phraseology derived from the acts of the body.[10]

All these testimonies, therefore, we must bear in mind, when examining the passages we are now about to consider as

[1] See p. 319 above. [2] See p. 329 above. [3] See p. 370 above.
[4] See pp. 376, 377 above. [5] See pp. 378, 379 above.
[6] See p. 389 above. [7] See p. 393 above. [8] See pp. 402—404 above.
[9] See pp. 421, 422 above. [10] See p. 423 above.

adduced by the Authors under review in support of their doctrine.

The first passage quoted by Archdeacon Wilberforce is one in which Chrysostom says, that Christ—"Gave not simply his "own Body; but because the former nature of the flesh, which "was framed out of the earth, had first become deadened by "sin, and destitute of life, he brought in, as one may say, "another sort of dough and leaven, his own Flesh, by nature "indeed the same, but free from sin, and full of life; and gave "to all to partake thereof [*i. e.* of his own flesh], that being "nourished by this, and laying aside the old dead material, "we might be blended together unto eternal life, by means of "this Table."[1]

From these words the Archdeacon infers that Chrysostom held, that the body of Christ must be contained in the bread so as to be swallowed by the mouth. His words indeed are, that Chrysostom here says, "that our Lord's humanity has been communicated, as a consecrating principle, for the renewal of all mankind." But these are vague phrases, such as Archdeacon Wilberforce delights in, which might be understood in an orthodox sense. It is not the *fact* of the communication of our Lord's humanity, but the *mode* of that communication, that is in question. We are, no doubt, united to his human nature as the branch of a tree to its root, and there is a correspondent communication between the two. But the point in dispute is, how this union is effected. And what the Archdeacon means by these phrases is, that the body of Christ is within the consecrated substance, so as to be swallowed by the mouth. Now the passage itself, when taken as a whole, appears to me to show that no such inference is deducible from it. For we must, of course, understand the mode of nourishment here spoken of to be similar to the mode in which the communicant "lays aside the old dead material" of his own body. What the latter mode is, I need not point out. And the former is clearly of a similar kind. The spiritual union of our Lord's human nature with ours is a truth which I do not call in question; nor do I doubt that that spiritual union may be produced or renewed by a faithful

[1] WILB. Doctr. of Euch. p. 103; or 3rd ed. p. 88. The passage is from Chrysost. Comm. in 1 Cor. x. 17. hom. 24. § 2. Op. x. p. 214.

participation of the symbols of Christ's Body and Blood. But I deny that for that spiritual union there is any need of a real substantial presence of Christ's Body and Blood within the bread and wine, so as to be swallowed by the mouth. And Chrysostom's words no more imply this, than they imply that the communicant actually and really lays aside any part of his body. And, as we have seen,[1] he uses still stronger phrases as to the effects of faith and baptism in making us partakers of Christ's Body, where no one supposes an *oral* reception of that Body.

This latter consideration also at once removes any difficulty that might be felt respecting the next passage quoted from him by the Archdeacon, where, as the Archdeacon urges, "Chrysostom speaks of it as the effect of the Holy Eucharist, 'that we may not only be joined in Christ by love, but may be united in reality to his flesh. And this is brought about through the food which he has given us; for, wishing to show the desire which he has for us, he has by this means mixed himself with us, and united his body to us, that we might be one, as a body united to its head.'"[2]

From this passage Archdeacon Wilberforce argues, that Chrysostom must have considered our Lord's body to be really and substantially present in the consecrated *res sacra*. But Chrysostom's use of the same terms with reference to the effects of baptism shows that this argument is altogether unfounded. That they mean more than that our Lord "is only an object to men's thoughts" may be readily granted to the Archdeacon, but this is not the question at issue. And it would have been better if the Archdeacon had fairly grappled with the real doctrine of nine-tenths of those against whom he writes, instead of arguing as if there was no intermediate doctrine between that of a reception of Christ's real substantial body by the mouth, and that of its being merely an object of contemplation to the minds of men.

It is quite true, that these words of Chrysostom, viewed alone and in the abstract by one unacquainted with his usual mode of speaking on such subjects, might appear strongly to favor

[1] See pp. 376, 377, and 378, 379, above.

[2] pp. 169, 170; or, 3rd ed. p. 145. The passage is from Chrys. in Joann. hom. xlvi. 3. viii. 272.

the doctrine for which the Archdeacon quotes them. But when we find the same expressions used with reference to matters where they can bear no such meaning, the argument at once falls to the ground.

And any one who is acquainted with Chrysostom's character and style must admit, that in going to his writings to learn the doctrine of the antient Church, we must make the same allowance as we should have to make in consulting the Sermons of any popular preacher, celebrated for his tropes and metaphors, his hyperboles and superlatives, to ascertain the real doctrine of his Church.

The Archdeacon refers to Chrysostom's Comment on John vi. as bearing out his views, and he tells us that his—

"Commentary is most distinct in its statements, that from the 51st verse, where our Lord introduces the subject of his Body and Blood, he is referring immediately to the Holy Eucharist. The earlier part of the Chapter, St. Chrysostom says, may be explained in general of those blessings which were bestowed by the Mediator. 'The bread of life is our Lord's salutary doctrine, and faith in himself, or his own Body.' (Chrys. In Johann. hom. xlvi. 1. viii. 270.) These things are all involved in the system of the Gospel when viewed at large. But when he comes to the 51st verse (p. 271.) he thinks it necessary to account for the fact, that our Lord should have spoken of a topic which at the time it was not possible for his hearers to understand. And the purpose of that Holy Sacrament, to which he says our Lord is here referring, is explained thus: 'I have become a partaker of Flesh and Blood for your sakes; again that very Flesh and Blood by which I have become akin to you I give back to you.' (p. 273.)"[1]

Now, this statement is full of errors, arising partly from that habit which the Archdeacon has so much indulged, of not confining his report of the statements of an author to that which he has actually said, but giving it according to his own view of what that author had in his mind.

So far from Chrysostom stating that "from the 51st verse" our Lord is referring to the Eucharist, and that the earlier part of the chapter relates to the blessings bestowed by the Mediator, he expressly says on the words, "I am the bread of life," in

[1] Wilb. Doct. of Euch. pp. 205, 206; or 3rd ed. pp. 175, 176.

v. 35,—"For the rest of the discourse he is about to devote himself to the delivery of the mysteries."[1] Nor does he say one word about "the purpose of the Holy Sacrament," when he uses the language here quoted from him by the Archdeacon.

It is quite true that he explains this chapter as if our Lord had been expressly referring to the Eucharist in it. But nevertheless, he does not speak so as to identify the reception of the consecrated elements with the reception of our Lord's real Body and Blood. As I have already pointed out,[2] he says on the words in v. 60, "This is a hard saying" (which had reference to our Lord's admonition as to eating his flesh and drinking his blood), that this was not the case, because our Lord was speaking "concerning doctrines, directing his discourse throughout to the faith that was to be placed on himself;" and he goes on to observe, that they thought it "hard," because they did not understand our Lord's character; and then on v. 63 he proceeds to show, that our Lord's whole discourse is to be spiritually understood.

From that exposition of v. 63 the Archdeacon has quoted a passage in support of his own views.[3] But as I have already fully dealt with this quotation, and shown that it has no such meaning, but the contrary, I must refer the reader to the remarks I have there made respecting it.[4]

But I would here direct the reader's attention to a few other passages in Chrysostom's comment on this chapter, further illustrative of his doctrine in the matter.

Thus, immediately after the passage quoted by the Archdeacon, in which he speaks of giving us his flesh and blood (by which the Archdeacon would wish us to understand that he meant our swallowing them), he says that this blood "moistens the soul," that it "washed the whole world," that it "cleansed the holy of holies;" that with this blood "the soul is washed, is beautified, is inflamed," &c.[5] Surely these latter expressions show at once how the first are to be understood.

Again, respecting the expressions that promise life and resurrection to those that eat the flesh of Christ, he says that "life"

[1] Μέλλει λοιπὸν εἰς τὴν τῶν μυστηρίων ἐμβαλεῖν παράδοσιν. CHRYS. In Johann. hom. xlv. § 2. Op. viii. 263.

[2] See p. 124 above. [3] p. 206, or, 3rd ed. 176. [4] See pp. 99, 100 above.

[5] CHRYS. In Johann. hom. xlvi. 3. Op. viii. 273.

here is not *ordinary life*, but the life of glory above. "What Christ says," he observes, "is this: He that eateth my flesh, shall not perish when he dies, nor shall he be punished. Nor does he speak of a common resurrection; for all shall rise again alike; but respecting a peculiar and glorious resurrection, and one to which a reward is attached."[1]

But this effect is not common to all the communicants; and therefore, according to Chrysostom, all do *not* eat the flesh of Christ.

And then in the next two pages he proceeds to point out more expressly that the words of our Lord are to be *understood spiritually*, in passages which I have already placed before the reader when dealing with the Scriptural testimony on this subject.[2]

The Archdeacon further argues, that Chrysostom held the presence of Christ's body in the Eucharistic elements to be not a mere symbolical presence, but a real substantial one, because our Lord's presence is spoken of by him as if it was mysterious and wonderful, and because he exhorts us not to look merely at what meets the eye in the consecrated elements, but to remember that our Lord said, "This is my body," and to view them with the eyes of the mind.[3]

But, as we have seen,[4] he speaks in similar terms of baptism, calling it "those sacred and awful mysteries;" and without any notion of a real substantial presence within the elements, he may well exhort us to look upon the consecrated elements as being much more than what meets the eye in them, even as being in *character*, *operation*, and *effect* Christ's body and blood. Through them the presence of Christ is vouchsafed to our spirits, and we are spiritually united to him.

And when we recollect his language respecting baptism, and also the way in which he speaks of Christ "lying before us slain" on the Table, and his blood being "emptied into the

[1] Ὁ δὲ λέγει τοιουτόν ἐστιν· ὁ τρώγων μου τὴν σάρκα, οὐκ ἀπολεῖται τελευτήσας, οὐδὲ κολασθήσεται. Ἀλλ' οὐδὲ περὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως τῆς κοινῆς φησι· καὶ γὰρ ὁμοίως πάντες ἀνίστανται· ἀλλὰ περὶ τῆς ἐξαιρέτου, τῆς ἐνδόξου, καὶ μισθὸν ἐχούσης. Id. ibid. hom. xlvii. 1. p. 276.

[2] See pp. 99, 100 above.

[3] p. 231; or, 3rd ed. p. 197. The passage quoted is from Chrys. In Matt. xxvi. 34. hom. 82. 4. Op. vii. 787.

[4] See p. 391 above.

cup from his immaculate side,"[1]—expressions which cannot be understood of that immaterial presence of his glorified body imagined by the Authors under review, but are clearly only rhetorical and figurative,—we can find no difficulty in understanding the meaning of those passages which the Archdeacon quotes from him in another place.[2]

Thus, for instance, he quotes Chrysostom as saying that, "if we come with faith, we shall assuredly see him [Christ] lying in the manger. For this table stands in the place of the manger. And there will lie the Body of the Lord; not wrapped as then in swaddling clothes, but on every side clothed with the Holy Ghost."[3] And that angels "tremble at the Church's sacrifice," and "minister at that table."[4] All such language is evidently merely that of a rhetorician, and can no more be understood literally than that in which he speaks of the communicants being "made red with the blood of Christ."

If the Archdeacon wishes to see what the consequences would be of maintaining that Chrysostom's language on this matter is to be interpreted literally, let him cast his eye over such passages as the following:—

"When the mystic table is prepared, the Lamb of God sacrificed for thee, the priest earnestly engaged for thee, spiritual fire bursting out from the undefiled Table, the Cherubim standing around, and the Seraphim flying, the six-winged creatures covering their faces, all the incorporeal powers with the priest making supplication for thee, the spiritual fire descending, the blood in the cup for thy cleansing emptied from the undefiled side, dost thou not fear, art thou not ashamed to be found at that dreadful hour a liar?"[5]

"Wherefore when ye approach, think not that ye receive the Divine body as from man; but as from the Seraphim themselves, with the tongs of fire which Isaiah saw, think that ye receive the Divine body; and as touching with the lips the Divine and undefiled side, so let us partake of the saving blood."[6]

"He [Christ] hath given to those who desire him, not only to see him, but also to touch him, and to eat him, and to fix their teeth in his flesh, and to embrace him, and to fulfil all their desire."[7]

[1] See p. 282 above. [2] pp. 301, 302.
[3] p. 302. From Chrys. hom. de B. Philogon. iii. vol. i. p. 498.
[4] Ib. From Chrys. hom. de incompr. Dei Nat. iii. 7. i. 470.
[5] Chrys. De Pœnit. hom. ix. Op. ii. 349. [6] Id. ibid. p. 350.
[7] Chrys. In Johann. hom. xlvi. § 3. Op. viii. 272.

A similar passage has already been quoted in a former part of this chapter.[1]

And these are not specimens of what merely occurs now and then in Chrysostom's writings, but fair illustrations of his ordinary style.

How they are to be understood, it would surely be a waste of time to discuss.

Again, he claims Chrysostom as maintaining, that "our Lord as present in the elements is entitled to the same reverence which was paid him when he was visibly manifest in the flesh," and that "our Lord's Body, as present in the Holy Eucharist, is a fit *object of worship*,"[2] because he speaks of the *Energumeni* as called upon to "bow the head" when the oblation was offered, and as brought into the Church and placed as criminals would be at the time the judge was going to take his place, "when Christ is about, as it were, to seat himself on a lofty tribunal, and to appear in the mysteries themselves."[3]

But the argument falls at once when we remember the similar language of Chrysostom respecting occasions when no real presence of Christ's Body is imagined by any one. I might indeed raise the objection, that when the oblation was offered the consecration of the elements was not completed, and consequently the real presence of Christ's body not yet vouchsafed, even according to the doctrine of the Archdeacon himself. But waiving this, we have already seen[4] precisely the same language used by Chrysostom when speaking of the posture of "the king himself, when the Gospels are being read," who, he tells us, "stands "with all fear and all attention, and does not suffer the crown "to encircle his head, but *bows down his head* on account of "God speaking in his holy Gospels."

And, in fact, the reason given by Chrysostom, why the Energumeni should thus bow the head, alone subverts the Archdeacon's argument; for he tells us that it was because it was not lawful for them to join in prayer with the common assembly of the brethren, and that they might thus "make supplications

[1] See p. 322 above. [2] pp. 302, 303; or, 3rd ed. pp. 259, 260.

[3] The passages of Chrysostom here referred to occur in his Hom. de incomprehens. Dei Nat. iii. 7 and iv. 4. Op. i. pp. 470 and 477.

[4] See pp. 487, 488 above.

by the very position of the body."[1] So that it was intended merely as a substitute for *prayer*.

And in another homily attributed to Chrysostom, similar language is used respecting those who approach the baptismal font:—

"When ye have come near the dreadful and at the same time desirable baptismal font, and *as captives ye fall down before the king*, cast yourselves all together upon your knees, and having stretched out your hands to heaven, where the King of us all sits in royal state, and directed your eyes to that sleepless Eye, use these words to the Merciful One, Open thy vineyard to us, O Lord."[2]

Now, whether this homily was written by Chrysostom or not, it illustrates the real meaning of the passage quoted from Chrysostom by the Archdeacon, and shows that the practice of which that passage speaks did not indicate any notion of the actual presence of our Lord's body on earth. For we here find similar acts of reverence spoken of, and yet our Lord is expressly mentioned as sitting in heaven.

Again, to prove that there must be a real substantial presence of Christ's body and blood within the consecrated elements, the Archdeacon urges, that the Fathers held, that "our Lord's human body is the medium through which his relation to mankind is brought about;" and he mentions, as one proof, that Chrysostom supposes our Lord to say,—"I willed to become your brother. For your sakes I shared in flesh and blood. Again I give to you the very flesh and the blood, through which I became your kinsman."[3]

Now it is very true, that "our Lord's human body is the medium through which his relation to mankind is brought about," and that he gives us his flesh and blood. But the question at issue is, in what *way* this is done. And this is just the point which is not noticed in this passage. I maintain that this participation of our Lord's flesh and blood is not brought about by

[1] Τῷ σχήματι τοῦ σώματος ποιεῖσθαι τὰς ἱκετηρίας. loc. cit. p. 470.

[2] Ἐπειδὰν πλησίον γένησθε τῆς φοβερᾶς ὁμοῦ καὶ ποθεινῆς κολυμβήθρας, [καὶ] ὡς αἰχμάλωτοι προσπέσητε τῷ βασιλεῖ, ῥίψατε πάντες ὁμοίως ἐπὶ γόνατα, καὶ τὰς χεῖρας ἀνατείναντες εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ὅπου κάθηται βασιλικῶς ὁ πάντων ἡμῶν βασιλεὺς, κ. τ. λ. Chrys. vel Pseudo-Chrys. Homil. In illud, *Simile est regnum cælorum*. § 4. Op. viii. App. pp. 104, 105. The Benedictines consider this homily not to be Chrysostom's.

[3] p. 262. The passage is from Chrys. In Johann. hom. xlvi. 3. vol. viii. p. 273.

any *oral* reception of his real substantial body and blood, but that it is altogether a spiritual transaction. And it is obvious that these words of Chrysostom do not *touch* this question.

Again, the Archdeacon urges, that Chrysostom says that "we taste of that Body that sitteth above, that is adored by angels, that is next to the Power that is incorruptible;"[1] and that "He who sits on high with the Father is held at that moment in the hands of all men."[2]

How it can be supposed that such passages testify in favor of the doctrine here opposed, it is difficult to conceive. When it is distinctly stated that the Body partaken of is "above," the inference seems naturally to follow, that the mode in which it is to be partaken of is of a spiritual kind, and that it is not to be swallowed by the mouth. And, in fact, the context of the latter passage shows at once what is the meaning of the words. For it runs thus;—"He who sits above with the Father is at that time held in the hands of all, and gives himself *to those who desire the gift*, that they may embrace and lay hold of him. BUT ALL DO THIS BY THE EYES OF FAITH."[3]

Sacramentally and symbolically our Lord's body is held in the hands of the communicants, but the substantial body is "above." The phrase is very similar to that which we have seen used by Augustine when he said that Christ bore his body in his own hands, which in the context he qualifies by the condition that he did so "in a certain manner," and elsewhere speaks of "the *bread* which our Lord carried in his hands," and says that the Lord said, "This is my body," "when he was giving a *sign* of his body."[4]

Another passage is also quoted by the Archdeacon from the Letter to Cæsarius, attributed to Chrysostom, to prove the real substantial presence of our Lord's body in or with the bread received into the mouth of the communicant. The passage was written against the error of those who supposed that the human nature was absorbed and lost in the Divine in the person of Christ, so that there remained but one nature in him. It is not

[1] p. 336; or, 3rd ed. pp. 289, 290. Thepassage is from Chrys. Comm. in Ephes. hom. iii. 3. Op. xi. p. 21.

[2] Ibid. From Chrys. De sacerd. iii. 4. Op. i. 382. The whole passage is quoted p. 421 above.

[3] See the whole passage p. 421 above.

[4] See pp. 510, 511 above.

correctly given by the Archdeacon, and cannot have been translated from the original by him.[1] I will, therefore, here subjoin it:—

"Christ is God and man; God because he was impassible; man because he suffered. One Son, one Lord, one and the same person possessing beyond doubt one dominion and power over the united natures, although they are not consubstantial, and each preserves the unmixed perception of its proper nature, because the two are not intermingled. For as before the bread is sanctified, we call it bread, but when divine grace sanctifies it through the medium of the priest, it is freed from the title of bread and thought worthy of the title of the Lord's Body, even though the nature of bread has remained in it, and we do not speak of two bodies but one body of the Son, so here also the divine nature resting upon the body, the two make up one Son, one Person; to be acknowledged nevertheless as being so without confusion in an inseparable way, not in one nature only, but in two perfect natures."[2]

Now, in what way this can prove the point for which it is quoted, it is difficult indeed to see. For, all the change that the words contemplate with relation to the bread is, that "*divine grace sanctifies it,*" and that consequently, having this sanctification by Divine grace, though it remains bread as before, it is considered worthy of the title of the Lord's Body. Not the slightest intimation is given of the junction of the Lord's Body with the bread. And the words, "we do not speak of two bodies, but one body of the Son," forbid the notion that while

[1] He gives it thus:—"Christ is God and man. God, because he was impassible, man because he suffered. . . . Just as before the bread is sanctified, we call it bread, but when divine grace sanctifies it through the medium of the priest, it is freed from the title of bread, and thought worthy of the title of our Lord's Body, even though the nature of bread has remained in it; and we do not speak of two bodies, but the one Body of the Son." CHRYS. iii. 744. WILB. Doctr. of Euch. p. 286, or 3rd ed. p. 245. In this quotation he has stopped in the middle of a sentence, the two parts of which are connected together by the words *sicut enim* and *sic*; and by translating *sicut enim* "just as," has made the words that follow, refer to what *precedes* instead of to *that which comes after*.

[2] Propter quod et Deus et homo Christus, &c. Sicut enim antequam sanctificetur panis, panem nominamus, divina autem illum sanctificante gratia, mediante sacerdote, liberatus est quidem ab appellatione panis, dignus autem habitus Dominici corporis appellatione, etiamsi natura panis in ipso permansit, et non duo corpora sed unum corpus Filii prædicamus: *οὕτω καὶ ἐνταῦθα τῆς θείας ἐνιδρυμένης τῷ σώματι φύσεως, ἕνα υἱὸν, ἓν πρόσωπον τὸ συναμφότερον ἀπετέλεσαν· γνωριζόμενον μέντοι ἀσυγχύτως ἀδιαιρέτῳ λόγῳ, οὐκ ἐν μιᾷ μόνῃ φύσει, ἀλλ' ἐν δυσὶ τελείαις.* CHRYS. Ep. ad Cæsar. mon. Op. iii. 744.

the material body of Christ remains in heaven, it can be present on earth with the bread, for that (notwithstanding the Archdeacon's denial) *would be* making two bodies of the Son.

The comparison here instituted is between Christ as symbolically represented in the Eucharist, and the real Person of Christ. The symbolical Christ of the Eucharist is bread to which sanctification by Divine grace is given, without altering the nature of the bread, which remains bread as before. The real Person of Christ is formed by the union of the Divine nature with the human body, while that human body retains its nature and properties.

The passage might be thus paraphrased :—The bread and the sanctification of Divine grace given to it make up the typical and symbolical body of Christ in the Eucharist, and are called the Lord's Body, though the bread retains its nature and properties as bread; and these two things make up one body, for there is but one body of the Son : so the real body of Christ and the Divine nature resting upon it make up one Son, one Person, though the body retains the properties of a human body; for there is but one Son, though two perfect natures are joined in him.

Whatever may be thought of the nature of the illustration, and whatever imperfections may be pointed out in it, this, it is clear, is the argument contemplated by the writer. And I must add, it is, like many Patristical arguments, weak and far-fetched.

The quotations of the Archdeacon from Chrysostom to prove that he held that our Lord's real body is received by the wicked as well as the faithful,[1] fall at once to the ground, when it is recollected, that it is the common practice of the Fathers to call the sacramental signs by the names of the things signified by them. And it is a matter for surprise and regret, that a fact so clearly established by the testimony of the Fathers themselves should be so completely kept out of sight as it is in the works under review.

Another passage is quoted by the Archdeacon from Chry-

[1] p. 308; or 3rd ed. p. 265. The passages are these :—" How shalt thou present thyself before the Judgment-seat of Christ, thou who presumest upon his Body with polluted hands and lips." CHRYS. In Ephes. hom. iii. 4. Op. xi. 22. " I will rather lose my life than give our Lord's blood to the unworthy." ID. In. Matth. hom. lxxxii. 6. Op. vii. 790.

sostom,[1] which he seems to think goes even beyond his own doctrine as to the nature of the change which it attributes to the elements; appearing to imply, that they become wholly the Body and Blood of Christ, and that there is nothing at all remaining in the Eucharistic elements which can be received by the body as corporeal food, which he considers an "error," and seems to doubt whether Chrysostom is the author. The passage he gives thus:—

"Behold not that it is bread, nor think that it is wine. For it does not like other food pass into the draught. God forbid that you should think so. But as wax, when it is brought into contact with fire, suffers no diminution nor increase of its substance, so imagine that the mysteries are absorbed in the substance of the body."[2]

Now, into the question of the authorship of this homily I shall not here enter. I shall only observe that, whoever the author may have been, the doctrine here opposed gains no support from it. Not only does it not favor the doctrine of such a change as that which the Archdeacon supposes it to maintain, but it is irreconcileable with it, unless the author imagined a presence and participation of the body of Christ such as both the Authors under review and the Romanists would repudiate. For when it speaks of "the mysteries" being "absorbed in the substance of the body," the mysteries cannot be the real body and blood of Christ, because none hold that the body and blood of Christ can become part of the substance of our bodies. If therefore the writer held that "the mysteries" became the body and blood of Christ, and were absorbed in the substance of the body, either he was not Chrysostom, or Chrysostom's orthodoxy on the point must be given up. If he did not hold that such a change took place, the passage is not relevant to the point in question. And the notion advocated in it is not worth further discussion.

The method by which the Archdeacon endeavours to get rid of the objection to his theory deduced from such expressions as that "the sacred blood of Christ was spilt,"—which we have seen to be used by Chrysostom,[3] and to which the Archdeacon al-

[1] pp. 282, 283; or 3rd ed. p. 242.

[2] The passage is from Chryst. De Pœnit. hom. ix. Op. ii. 350.

[3] See p. 244 above.

ludes,[1]—may be ingenious, but is hardly entitled to higher praise. He tells us that as the sacrament,—that is, he means, the consecrated *res sacra*—consists of two things, the visible sign and the inward reality, "it may be described *either by its outward or* "*its inward portion*, as St. Paul speaks sometimes of bread and "wine, and sometimes of the Body and Blood of Christ; and "the one part may borrow the attributes of the other, as the "Fathers speak of *touching* or *breaking* the Body of Christ, "though it is the *sacramentum*, or sensible part only, which "can be touched or broken." And then he adds,—"Such a "distinction is observable when St. Chrysostom, in his private "letter to Pope Innocent, respecting the violence perpetrated in "the Church at Constantinople, says that 'the sacred blood of "Christ was spilt;' while Palladius, in the Life of St. Chry-"sostom, which he intended for the public, speaks of the in-"truders as having 'spilt the symbols.' (Chrys. Op. vol. xiii. "p. 34.)"

That is, refusing to recognize the undeniable practice of the Fathers of calling the symbol by the name of the thing signified by it, and resolved to maintain, that whenever the Fathers use the terms Body and Blood of Christ, they mean his real substantial Body and Blood, the Archdeacon is driven to the assertion, that the *real* Body and Blood of Christ may be said to be broken and spilt, and be the objects of sight and touch to us, because the bread and wine, which he supposes to be united to them, may be so. That is, a thing which *cannot* be broken or spilt may be said to be so, because another thing to which it is united may be. Taking the matter, therefore, according to the Archdeacon's own view of it,—that is, *supposing* the Body and Blood of Christ to be so united to the bread and wine as to form one compound whole with them—the argument is like the assertion that the soul of man may properly be said to be broken or spilt, because the body and blood joined to it may be so spoken of. To such a notion I must be permitted to decline giving my assent.

I have now gone through all the citations made by the Archdeacon from Chrysostom in support of his views, and leave the reader to form his own judgment respecting them.

[1] p. 243; or, 3rd ed. p. 208.

Dr. Pusey's extracts[1] form, as usual, a heterogeneous mass of passages on the general subject of the Eucharist; most of them at once disposed of by the consideration that the Fathers commonly called the signs by the names of the things signified by them, and others wholly *opposed* to the doctrine in support of which they are adduced.

For instance, he quotes the words,—"It is in no common manner that our lips are honoured, when they receive the Lord's Body."[2]

So, as we have seen,[3] Isidore of Seville speaks of the Lord's Body entering our mouth before other meat, and immediately adds the reason why the symbol is called the Lord's Body.

The fact that the signs are called by the names of the things signified, sweeps away at once the larger portion of Dr. Pusey's testimonies.

But there are also some which are directly *opposed* to his doctrine.

Thus in pp. 545, and 581, 582, he quotes the passages from the treatise "De Sacerdotio," and the Comment on 1 Cor., which I have given in pp. 319 and 420—422 above; which are clearly *opposed* to his doctrine. And there are many similar extracts among those he has given.

Of the rest, the most important have been already considered among the testimonies adduced by Archdeacon Wilberforce. And there are none which may not at once be explained, either on the same grounds as those already noticed, or by the consideration that Chrysostom, giving to the symbols the name of the Body and Blood, speaks of them in every respect as if they were Christ himself lying upon the Table, and indulges his usual strain of rhetoric in the language he uses respecting them.

One passage[4] evidently refers to the presence of Christ *as God*, for it speaks of him as discerning the state of mind of the communicants; and therefore it is wholly irrelevant.

[1] Pusey's Doctr. of Real Pres. vind. in Notes, &c. pp. 544—597.

[2] Ibid. p. 590. The passage is from Chrys. hom. xxx. in 2 Cor. Op. x. 650.

[3] See p. 242 above.

[4] "When then thou art about to approach to the Holy Table, think that there the King of all is present; for he is present indeed, observing the mind of all, and seeth who approacheth with befitting holiness, and who with an evil conscience, with unclean and foul thoughts and wicked deeds." Chrys. In ill. Vidi Dom. hom. v. § 3. vi. 142. Pusey, loc. cit. p. 564.

But I must add a few words on the passages quoted by Dr. Pusey to show that Chrysostom holds (to use Dr. Pusey's phraseology) "the inward substance" to be "*in* the outward;"[1] that is, the Body and Blood of Christ to be *inside* or *within* the Bread and Wine.

In proof of this he quotes the following passages.

First, with respect to the Blood being *in* the wine, after premising that the word "cup" in the Fathers is "altogether equivalent to the element of 'wine,' so that the 'cup' stands for the one element as much as the Bread for the other," he observes that Chrysostom says,—

"This which is *in* the cup is that which flowed from the side, and thereof do we partake;" and "the Blood *in* the cup is drawn for thy cleansing from the undefiled side."[2]

Now, I leave it simply to the judgment of the reader, whether the words "*This* which is in the *cup*," (by which the visible liquid contained in the cup is manifestly referred to) mean "This invisible and immaterial blood of Christ which is in the *wine* which is in the cup." To state such a notion is to demolish it. And the words that follow ("the Blood in the cup") evidently refer to the same thing, that is, the liquid in the cup.

And I would ask Dr. Pusey himself, whether he would maintain, that the Blood of Christ, which he imagines to be present within the wine, is "drawn from the side" of our Lord's body. If not, how can he contend that *this* phrase is to be understood *metaphorically*, but yet nevertheless that *the rest* of the sentence is to be understood *literally*?

Secondly, with respect to the body of Christ being *in* the bread, he refers[3] to the following passage:—

"Since then the Lord says, 'This is my Body,' let us both obey and believe, and see it with spiritual eyes. For Christ[4] gives us nothing to be perceived by sense; but *in* things of sense, all spiritual. So also in Baptism, the gift takes place through a matter of sense, i. e. the water; but what is wrought is spiritual, the regeneration and renewal. For if thou wert incorporeal, he would have given thee nakedly the incorporeal gifts; but, since the soul is

[1] p. 544 and pp. 133 and 277.

[2] Notes, &c. p. 133. The passage is from Chrys. In 1 Cor. x. hom. 24. § 3.

[3] See p. 277 compared with 544.

[4] The word in Dr. Pusey is "It," but this must be a misprint for "Christ."

united with the body, he giveth thee the things spiritual *in things sensible*." [1]

Now, as to the meaning of the word "in" in such passages, I have already made some remarks when considering the testimony of Cyril of Jerusalem and Augustine. But here the argument falls at once when we refer to the original. For the words translated by Dr. Pusey "*in* things of sense," are αἰσθητοῖς πράγμασι, so that the word "in" in that place, on which Dr. Pusey rests so much, is *his own addition*, and *contrary* to the manifest sense of the words, for the words do not *admit* of the meaning "*within* sensible things." And although the words ἐν αἰσθητοῖς, "in things sensible," do occur at the end of the sentence, their meaning is evidently the same as that of αἰσθητοῖς πράγμασι in the former part of it. The sense clearly is, that spiritual things are given *through*, or *by*, or *by means of*, sensible things.

And in this very passage Chrysostom parallels the way in which the spiritual gift is conferred in the Eucharist with the way in which it is conferred in Baptism; where, he says, the gift "takes place through a matter of sense, i. e., the water." But the gift is not united with the water so as to make one compound whole with it.

### Cyril of Alexandria (fl. a. 412.)

It is from this Father, more particularly, as it seems to me, that Archdeacon Wilberforce has derived his doctrine on the subject of the Eucharist; but, I conceive, through an entire misapprehension of Cyril's meaning. I shall now, therefore, endeavour to show the reader the true sense of the passages he and Dr. Pusey have quoted from Cyril as supporting their views.[2]

To have a clear understanding of his real doctrine, it is important to bear in mind the points on which the passages already quoted have shown his views, because we shall then come to the consideration of the passages to be explained, with some knowledge of his general doctrine on the subject.

[1] p. 277. The passage is from Chrys. In. Matth. hom. 82. § 4. Op. vii. 787.

[2] The passages quoted by Archdeacon Wilberforce occur in various parts of his volume, the references to which will be given below. Those quoted by Dr. Pusey will be found in pp. 614—664 of his work, as above cited.

We have seen, then, that he held, (1) that it was "*bread*" which our Lord gave to his disciples at the Last Supper;"[1] (2) that Christ is absent from us so far as his human nature is concerned, and present only by his divinity, his flesh being absent from us on account of its having gone to heaven, and that his Spirit supplies the place of his presence and power;[2] (3) that a body, even if the Divine nature could be spoken of as a body, "must certainly be local, and have magnitude and quantity, and having quantity it cannot avoid circumscription;"[3] (4) that the faithful are made partakers of the flesh of Christ in baptism;[4] (5) that the body of Christ gives life to all who partake of it, and that he who receives the flesh of Christ is found in Christ and Christ is in him, and that the body of Christ causes him that has tasted of it to live for ever;[5] (6) that Christ is wholly introduced into us by faith, and dwells in us by the Holy Spirit, and that he is to us the beginning and foundation for sanctification and righteousness through faith, and in no other way, for thus does he dwell within us;[6] (7) that the consecrated water, in baptism, is transelemented, or re-elemented, into a certain divine and unspeakable power,[7] and that our Lord floats upon the waters of the font;[8] expressions which illustrate his meaning when using similar words respecting the consecrated elements in the Eucharist; (8) that our union and communion with our Lord's human nature is through the agency of the Holy Spirit.[9]

It would surely, then, be marvellous, if one who held that Christ's body is absent from us, as being in heaven, his Spirit supplying the place of his presence and power, and that a body must be local and have magnitude and quantity, and that all who receive the body of Christ are found in Christ and Christ in them, should nevertheless hold, that Christ's body is really present with us every day, and that we partake of his Spirit through receiving that body, and that his body comes to us in a spiritual and immaterial form, and is present, but not locally, nor as having magnitude and quantity, and that the wicked who

[1] See p. 236 above. [2] See pp. 302—305 above. [3] See p. 316 above.
[4] See pp. 327, 328 above. [5] See pp. 371, 372 above.
[6] See pp. 375, 376 above. [7] See pp. 398, 399 above. [8] See p. 328 above.
[9] See pp. 429—431 above.

are not found in Christ, nor Christ in them, receive his body as well as the faithful.

It will conduce, I think, to a better understanding of the statements in question, if we observe, at the outset, that they are made, not with any direct reference to the Eucharist, but in reply respectively to the errors of Arius and Nestorius.

The heretic Arius, in order to obtain an argument against the divinity of our Saviour, referred to our Lord's parable of the Vine and branches (John xv. 1.), and argued thus; that as our Lord himself compared himself to a Vine, and the Father to a husbandman, and as a vine and a husbandman are of different natures, therefore the Father and our Lord are not consubstantial; and to make good his argument, he denied that in calling himself a Vine he referred at all to his human nature, because our bodies do not depend upon his human nature as the branches do upon the Vine.

Now, our communion and conjunction with Christ is more especially with Christ *as man*, with Christ considered *bodily*; for, as the Apostle says, "we are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones." (Eph. v. 30.) And this communion is such, that the gifts and graces of Christ's humanity as inhabited by the Holy Spirit, are communicated to us. "In him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead *bodily*," and we are "complete in him," for we "receive out of his fulness" and "grace for (or, upon) grace."

This doctrine our Blessed Lord expressed when he compared himself to the Vine and us to the branches. And in this parable he evidently referred more especially to his humanity, because the Vine and its branches are of the same nature, and therefore illustrate the conjunction of his human nature with ours. And spiritual gifts come to the members of his body through his human nature.[1]

Cyril, therefore, in his reply to the errors of Arius, is led from Arius's misinterpretation of John xv. 1. to show, that when our Lord calls himself a Vine and us the branches, he is speaking more especially of our union with his human nature, and therefore is led to insist upon our union with Christ being a union with *the body of Christ* as well as with his Divine nature, a

[1] See Ps. lxviii. 18; Eph. iv. 8, 15, 16; Acts ii. 31; John vii. 39; Rev. v. 6.

union therefore, in a certain sense, of a *bodily* as well as a *spiritual* kind; not referring in this to the *mode* in which the union is effected (respecting which there was no question between him and Arius), but to the *subjects* of the union.

Further, in reply to the error of Nestorius, which tended to the separation of the two natures of Christ into two Persons, he is led to urge the doctrine of the vivifying energy and power of the flesh of Christ in those who are united to it as an argument that there must be a hypostatical union of the Divine Word with it; because, if the Body of Christ was the body of a mere man, only supported in the same way as the saints of God may be, by the presence and power of the Godhead vouchsafed to him, the communion of his body could not produce the effect ascribed to it. And, according to the custom of the Fathers, using with reference to the Eucharistic symbols, through which the faithful receive the Body of Christ, the terms applicable in strictness of speech solely to the things which they represent, he speaks of what he calls the "mystical Eucharist" in the same terms which he would have used respecting the real body of Christ. But the object he had in view had no reference to the nature of the Eucharist, but only to the character and virtue of Christ's human nature from its hypostatical union with the Divine Word. And as we shall see hereafter, when Nestorius speaks of the flesh and blood of Christ as the *antitypes* of the consecrated elements, (*as received*), he repeats the phrase, and does not object to it.

Bearing this in mind, let us observe how Cyril meets the error of Arius in the following passage; *detached parts of which,* separated from the argument to which they belong, form one of the strongest evidences of Archdeacon Wilberforce and Dr. Pusey of the agreement of Cyril with their own views.[1]

"But since that foolish man, out of the rashness that dwells in him, loves to utter erroneous statements, and says that no reasoning will suffer us so to distort the scope of the passage before us [Joh. xv. 1.] from its right sense as to make it refer to the incarnation of Christ, for that we are not joined to him as it respects his body, even the Apostles not dwelling as branches in the body of Christ, nor being joined to him after this manner, but by disposition of mind and

[1] Wilb. pp. 110, 111, or 3rd ed. p. 94; and p. 260, or 3rd ed. p. 223. Pusey, Notes, pp. 639, 640.

sincere faith;[1] let us now briefly reply to these things, showing that he has spoken altogether irrationally, and has not trodden the right path of the Holy Scriptures. That we indeed are spiritually united to Christ by a disposition of mind suitable to perfect love, and by a right and unwavering faith, and by a virtuous and sincere operation of the understanding, the character of the doctrines we hold will by no means controvert; for we confess that they speak most correctly in saying this. But as to what they venture to say, *that we have no sort of conjunction with him according to the flesh*,[2] we shall show that to be altogether disconsonant with the inspired Scriptures. For how can there be any doubt, or who among those who are of sound views ever questioned, that Christ is a vine in this respect; and that we bearing the form of branches draw into ourselves the life that comes out of him and from him? Paul saying, 'For we all are one body in Christ, for we being many are one bread; for we are all partakers of that one bread.' For let any one tell us the cause, and proceed to show us the power of the mystical Eucharist. For on what account is it received within us? Is it not that it may cause Christ to dwell within us bodily by a participation and communion of his holy flesh?[3] I think verily that I have spoken correctly; for Paul writes that the Gentiles have been made 'concorporal and comparticipant and coheirs with Christ.' [Eph. iii. 6.] In what way, therefore, have they been manifested to be concorporal? Having been thought worthy to partake of the mystical Eucharist, they have become one body with him,[4] as, in truth, each one of the holy Apostles. Since for what reason did he call his own members, or rather the members of all as well as his own, members of Christ? For he writes thus, 'Know ye not, that your members are members of Christ? Shall I therefore take the members of Christ, and make them members of a harlot? God forbid.' Moreover the Saviour himself says, 'He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him.' For it is especially deserving of notice in this, that Christ says he will be in us not by a certain habit and disposition of mind only, but also by a natural participation.[5] For as any one who has joined one piece of wax to another and caused them to melt into one another by fire, makes one piece out of the two, so through the participation

[1] Οὐ γὰρ συνήφθημεν αὐτῷ κατὰ τὸ σῶμα, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ἔμενον οἱ ἀπόστολοι, ὡς κλήματα τυχὸν ἐν τῷ σώματι τοῦ Χριστοῦ, οὔτε μὴν αὐτῷ κατὰ τοῦτον συνήπτοντο τὸν λόγον, ἀλλὰ διαθέσει καὶ πίστει εἰλικρινεῖ.

[2] Ὡς οὐδεις ἡμῖν συναφείας τῆς κατὰ σάρκα πρὸς αὐτὸν ὁ λόγος.

[3] Λεγέτο γάρ τις ἡμῖν τὴν αἰτίαν, καὶ διδασκέτω παρελθὼν τῆς μυστικῆς εὐλογίας τὴν δύναμιν. γίνεται γὰρ ἐν ἡμῖν διατί; ἆρ' οὐχὶ καὶ σωματικῶς ἡμῖν ἐνοικίζουσα τὸν Χριστὸν τῇ μεθέξει καὶ κοινωνίᾳ τῆς ἁγίας αὐτοῦ σαρκός;

[4] Ἓν πρὸς αὐτὸν γέγονε σῶμα.

[5] Κατὰ μεθέξιν ἤτοι φυσικήν.

of the body of Christ and his precious blood, he is made one with us, and we again one with him. For in no other way could that which is by nature corruptible be made capable of vivification, but by being united bodily to the body of him who is life by nature, that is, of the Only-begotten.[1] And if you will not be persuaded by my words, give credence to Christ himself exclaiming, 'Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, ye have no life in you. He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day.' You hear him clearly announcing, that if we do not eat his flesh and drink his blood, we have not in ourselves, that is, in our flesh, eternal life. But most justly may the flesh of Life, that is, of the Only-begotten, be considered eternal life. But how or in what manner this will raise us up at the last day, you shall certainly hear, and I will not be slow to say. For when it [*i. e.* the flesh which our Lord assumed] became the flesh of Life, that is, of the Word that shone forth from God the Father, it passed into the power of life, and it is impossible that life should be overcome by death. Therefore since the Life is come into us, it will not be subject to the bonds of death, and will altogether overcome corruption, since it cannot suffer that which follows from corruption. For 'corruption cannot inherit incorruption,' as Paul says. For although Christ generally says, 'I will raise him up,' he does not attribute to his own flesh alone the power to raise the dead, but, God the Word, which is in it, being one with his own flesh, he says, 'I,' and very justly. For Christ is not divided into two sons, nor must any one suppose that his body is something separate from the Only-begotten, as certainly no one, I suppose, will say that our soul's body is something separate from our soul. Since therefore, as has been shown by us by these proofs, Christ is a vine in this respect, and we are branches, as having communion with him not only spiritually but bodily,[2] why does he vainly prate against us, saying, that since we do not hold communion with him bodily, but rather by faith and by a disposition of love according to the Law, Christ did not call his own flesh a vine, but rather his Godhead. And in truth, any one might say, why do you pass over the most proper and natural interpretation, and betake yourself to that which is remote? For must we not grant that it is most proper, that Jesus shall be a vine and we the branches according to the communion of the flesh, on account of our being in that respect

[1] Αὐτὸς μὲν ἐν ἡμῖν, ἡμεῖς δὲ αὖ πάλιν ἐν αὐτῷ συνενούμεθα. οὐ γάρ ἦν ἑτέρως ζωοποιηθῆναι δύνασθαι τὸ φθείρεσθαι πεφυκὸς, εἰ μὴ συνεπλάκη σωματικῶς τῷ σώματι τῆς κατὰ φύσιν ζωῆς, τοῦτ' ἔστι, τοῦ μονογενοῦς.

[2] Κλήματα δὲ ἡμεῖς, ἅτε δὴ καὶ τῆς πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐχόμενοι κοινωνίας, οὐχὶ μόνον πνευματικῆς ἀλλὰ καὶ σωματικῆς.

of the same nature?[1] For the branches are of the same nature with the vine. And we say these things, not as endeavouring to deny that we may be joined to Christ by a right faith and sincere love, but rather as showing that both spiritually and bodily[2] Christ is a vine and we the branches. The word of truth indeed is simple and clear; but the adversary craftily refuses to confess, that Christ is a vine also bodily, as one who gives to his branches, that is, to us, his own life, as the vine, which is the object of sense, and earthly, gives to the branches that have grown on it; but forcibly distorts the meaning of the idea to his Godhead alone." [3]

I have given this passage at length, in order that the reader may clearly see the *object* which Cyril had in view in these remarks. They were made, not with any reference to the doctrine of the Eucharist, but in reply to the unorthodox and clearly erroneous statement of Arius; and in opposition to his error they rightly maintain, that our union with Christ as the Vine of which we are branches is not merely a spiritual union with his Divine nature by which we enjoy the influences of the Divine Spirit, brought about on our parts by our faith and love, but it is a bodily union, a union of our souls and bodies with his human nature, which has been constituted as the source of vital influence to us, and with which a real union and communion is established, through a faithful participation of the Eucharist, such that we are, in the language of the Apostle, members of his body, concorporal with him; forming, together with our fellow-saints, one body with him, as two pieces of wax may be melted into one.

When therefore we come to see the object which Cyril had in view in these remarks, the whole argument raised out of this or any similar passages by Archdeacon Wilberforce falls to the ground.

Cyril is not here speaking at all, as the Archdeacon would have us suppose, of the *manner* in which we eat the flesh of Christ and drink his blood, and maintaining that we must eat and drink them with our bodily mouth as well as by the exercise of faith. Such a question has *nothing whatever to do* with the subject of his remarks. And were we to take the Archdeacon's representation of his language in this passage as

[1] Κατὰ τὴν τῆς σαρκὸς κοινωνίαν .... διὰ τὸ ὁμοφυές.

[2] Πνευματικῶς καὶ σωματικῶς.

[3] Cyrill. Alex. In Johann. lib. x. (in c. xv. v. 1.) Op. iv. 862—864.

correct, we must conclude him to be guilty of uttering what the Archdeacon himself would call a heretical sentiment, and maintaining that Christ's flesh was present in a material form as the object of the senses. For he tells us, that Cyril "declares that Christians are not only spiritually united to Christ by faith, love, and obedience, but likewise by 'FLESHLY CONTACT.'"[1] And this would follow from Cyril's remarks, if the Archdeacon's representation of their meaning were correct.

But the point which Cyril had in view was totally different. And however inexpedient some of his phrases might be in the present state of things in the Church, the truth he was endeavouring to establish is an important one, namely, our union and communion with Christ as man, and our derivation from his human nature of the life-giving influences it imparts to all who are united to it.

But the question whether we must eat and drink his real body and blood with our bodily mouth in order that such union and communion may be established, is a totally different question.

And the doctrine of an *oral* eating of Christ's real body and blood I shall endeavour to show was *not* held by Cyril.

But before I proceed to do so, I would call the reader's attention to the other passages cited from him, taken from his statements in reply to the error of Nestorius.

Now, of the passages in which he meets the errors of Nestorius, the following, I suppose, will be allowed to be as strong as any, if not the strongest, that the Archdeacon can quote as appearing to favor his doctrine. I give them as quoted by the Archdeacon, and therefore do not add the original. They seem to me fairly translated:—

[1] WILB. On Euch. p. 260; or, 3rd ed. p. 223. He refers to the words *συναφεία κατὰ σάρκα*, which he thus translates. But, as we have seen, this is a complete misrepresentation of the passage in Cyril. For the words occur in his statement of Arius's doctrine, "that we have no *sort of conjunction* with Christ according to the flesh" (*οὐδεὶς ἡμῖν συναφείας τῆς κατὰ σάρκα πρὸς αὐτὸν ὁ λόγος*), which Cyril undertakes to refute. But the doctrine involved in the negation of this statement of Arius is not that which the Archdeacon expresses. In fact, the Archdeacon himself, in another part of his work (p. 110), has translated these words in a totally different way, namely, "that there is no relation between our flesh and his;" which seems to me an equally erroneous translation. And how the Archdeacon can account for two such different translations in the same work, I must leave him to say.

"See then how he abides in us, and renders us superior to corruption, by introducing Himself, as I said, into our bodies through his own flesh, which is real food; whereas that shadow, which was under the law [i. e. manna] and the service which was connected with it had no reality. And the principle of this mystery is simple and true, not curiously devised for the service of impiety, but a simple truth. For we believe that the Word, the Son of the Father, having united Himself to the Body born of the Holy Virgin, with a reasonable soul (the union of course being ineffable and mystical), rendered his Body life-giving; being Himself, as God, the principle of life by nature; that by making us partakers of Himself, not only in spirit but in body,[1] He might render us superior to corruption; and do away, through Himself, the law of sin, which was in our fleshly members, and thus, as it is written, 'condemn sin in the flesh.' (Adv. Nestor. iv. 5. vol. vi. p. 113.)"[2]

"For as the Body of the Word is life-giving, since he has made it his own by a real union, which is beyond thought and expression, so we, who are partakers of his sacred Flesh and Blood, are by all means endued with life; since the Word abides in us in the way of Deity by the Holy Ghost, and in the way of Humanity by his sacred Flesh and precious Blood. To the truth of that which I have stated the holy Paul bears witness, when he writes to those who had believed on our Lord Jesus Christ at Corinth; 'I speak as to wise men, judge ye what I say. The cup of blessing,' &c. For by having been made partakers of the Holy Ghost, we are united to our common Saviour Christ, and to one another. But one Body we are in this way—because we being many, are one bread and one body, for we are all partakers of that one bread. (Adv. Nestor. iv. 5. vol. vi. p. 111.)"[3]

Similar passages of Cyril are quoted by the Archdeacon with a similar view in other parts of his work.[4] And he adds also other passages of a similar kind,[5] in order to draw from them a proof of the possibility of *the multipresence* of our Lord's Body, as being the Body of God. But as it respects this inference, I need only remark, that it is in direct opposition to the express statements of Cyril himself, as already quoted.[6]

[1] Πνευματικῶς τε ἅμα καὶ σωματικῶς.

[2] Wilb. On Euch. pp. 103 and 168; or, 3rd ed. pp. 88 and 144.

[3] Id. ib. p. 105; or, 3rd ed. p. 90.

[4] See pp. 168, 169; or, 3rd ed. pp. 144, 145.—pp. 259—261; or, 3rd ed. pp. 222—224.—p. 287; or, 3rd ed. p. 246.

[5] See pp. 156—162; or, 3rd ed. pp. 133—139.

[6] See pp. 302—305, and 316, above.

The doctrine, then, which, it may be alleged, is expressed in these passages, is this, that Christ's life-giving body is, through the Eucharist, received into our bodies, and becomes to them, through the power which belongs to it as hypostatically united to the Divine Word, a principle of life. I think it will be admitted, that this fairly expresses, in its strongest form, the doctrine to which the Archdeacon refers as contained in these passages. In fact, these words fully express the sense of the inferences he has deduced from them.[1]

From these various passages, then, in reply to Arius and Nestorius, it appears, that Cyril asserted in his statements in answer to the former, that we are joined bodily to Christ and are concorporal with him; and in his statements in answer to the latter, that Christ's life-giving body is received into our bodies so as to be a principle of life to them; and spoke of the Eucharist as instrumental for producing these effects.

The argument of the Archdeacon, then, is this,—That this cannot be the case but by our receiving Christ's body into ours by our bodily mouth, and therefore that the real body and blood of Christ must be in, or with, or under the form of, the consecrated elements.

I maintain, on the contrary, that *such* a bodily reception of Christ's body cannot be what is referred to by Cyril.

I do not doubt that we are united to Christ bodily,—that our souls and bodies are united to his human nature, and receive out of its fulness; nor do I doubt that the body of Christ, as the body of the Divine Word, united hypostatically to the Second Person of the Trinity, is life-giving to the souls and bodies of those who, through a faithful participation of the Eucharist, are brought into union and communion with it; nor therefore that the Eucharist is life-giving; as Cyril says, "he rendered his flesh life-giving, and thus the Eucharist became to us life-giving."[2]

All this is granted, and this is all that is asserted by Cyril. The question at issue is, Whether for this union it is necessary that the real body of Christ should be swallowed by the mouth.

[1] pp. 105 et seq.; or, 3rd ed. pp. 91 et seq.

[2] Ζωοποιὸν ἀπέφηνε τὴν ἑαυτοῦ σάρκα· ταύτῃτοι γέγονεν ἡμῖν εὐλογία ζωοποιός. Apol. adv. Orient. Op. vi. 192.

And *that* I assert not to be the doctrine of Cyril; and I maintain this not merely on the evidence of the passages already adduced from him in the second Section of this chapter, but on various other grounds.

*First*, such a reception does not produce the effect Cyril attributes to *that* reception of Christ's body of which he speaks. *Our bodies are not thereby made partakers of the life-giving efficacy of Christ's body.*[1]

And this I prove *from the Archdeacon's own statements.* He himself does not hold, that it is by any eating and drinking of Christ's body and blood with our bodily mouth, that *even our bodies* are brought into union and communion with that of our Blessed Lord. For he sees clearly that if he did, he must suppose our Lord's body and blood to be present in a material form,—which is out of the question. He himself says:—

"The Body of Christ, which we receive in this sacrament..... *does not and cannot act directly upon our material structure*, seeing that its Presence is not that natural Presence which would be an object to the senses, or supply nourishment to our bodily frame. Although we may pray, therefore, 'that our sinful bodies may be made clean by his Body,' as well as 'our souls washed by his most precious blood,' yet it is *only through a spiritual process that this work can be effected*, AND ITS MEDIUM MUST BE A BELIEVING HEART."[2]

And he intimates also elsewhere, that "the soul" must be the "channel through which the gift of Christ's presence in the Holy Eucharist" is to "affect and modify the whole body."[3]

And he also tells us, that it is "only through faith that the inward part, or *res sacramenti*, can be apprehended by the mind."[4]

So that the Archdeacon himself maintains, that the bodily union of the saints with their Lord is not and cannot be produced by the reception of our Lord's real body into theirs by the bodily mouth, but is solely producible through the medium of the soul; the soul being the channel through which the

[1] That this is the effect of the reception of which he speaks may be seen in the passages just quoted, but many others may be found pp. 371, 372 above.

[2] WILB. on Euch. p. 407, 3rd ed. p. 350. See the remarks on this point in pp. 177 et seq. above.

[3] Ibid. pp. 412, 413, 3rd ed. p. 355.

[4] Ibid. p. 405, 3rd ed. p. 349.

gift of Christ's presence is to affect the body, *and the soul apprehending that presence only by faith.*

According, therefore, to Archdeacon Wilberforce's own admission, there is no real union of the body of Christ with ours through our reception of Christ's body with the mouth, such as is spoken of by Cyril in that union which he likens to wax joined by liquefaction with other wax. Such a union is the consequence only of a reception of the body of Christ by the soul through faith, *which reception is not even helped by the reception of that body by the mouth;* for he admits, that the union, even as it respects the body, is only produced through the acts of the soul. Cyril's illustration, therefore, derived from the two pieces of melted wax, on which the Archdeacon insists, does not aid his argument in the least.

And, in fact, if the illustration of the junction of wax with wax through liquefaction is to be taken in its full sense, then the substance of Christ's Body must be supposed to be mingled with ours in a way which the Archdeacon himself would repudiate.

I ask him, then, what he gains by these passages in proof of his doctrine that the real body and blood of Christ must be so in, or with, or under the form of, the elements as to be swallowed by the mouth? These passages all speak of *that* reception of the body of Christ by which our bodies become vivified through it; which by the Archdeacon's confession does not follow from the *oral* reception of it. If the Archdeacon maintained, that the *oral* reception of Christ's real body into ours united the two, and thus introduced into our bodies a principle of life, because the body of Christ is life-giving, then I could understand his adducing these passages of Cyril in support of his argument, because, *taken literally and alone,* they might seem to favor it. But this he does not venture to do. He knows well that to suppose such a direct operation of the body of Christ, orally received, upon our bodies, would be directly opposed to a host of testimonies to be found in the Fathers, and would favor the Capernaite error.

His own doctrine, therefore, excludes him from raising out of these passages the argument he has attempted to extract from them. He cannot, according to his own doctrine, apply the words of Cyril in their literal sense, and say that because he

speaks of our bodies receiving the body of Christ, he must have held that our mouths swallowed the real body of Christ; because the reception of which Cyril speaks is *such a reception as the Archdeacon himself tells us can only be through the medium of the soul by faith.*

And it is important to observe, that the same objection lies against the *Romish* application of these passages of Cyril. For it is admitted by Bellarmine, that the Body of Christ when received, as he supposes, into the stomach, produces no direct effect of itself upon the receiver, and as soon as the accidents of bread, under the form of which it has been received, have perished, (though how such accidents, which never had any *substantial* existence, *can* perish, he does not tell us,) the Body somehow (how, he does not tell us) ceases to be there. It is confessed also by him, that the Body of Christ is "not directly apprehended by any of the senses, not even by the mind itself, except through faith," and that "the Body of the Lord apprehended by faith only, without the real presence, profits; while, on the other hand, that Body, if received by the body only, through the real presence, profits nothing."[1]

And therefore, when he urges, that, nevertheless, the reception of the real Body of Christ through the mouth into the stomach is useful, because faith and love are more excited, "when we consider that Christ is really united with us, than if we believe only that he is sitting in heaven,"[2] (which, by the way, I entirely deny,) the answer is obvious, namely, that he is *not* thus *united with us;* for, according to Bellarmine's own doctrine, the body of Christ lies in the stomach only, without being in any way united with us, ceasing altogether to be there as soon as the accidents of the bread have decayed. And his boasted proofs of *such* a conjunction of Christ's Body with ours, from "Irenæus, Hilary, Cyril, and other Fathers,"[3] because these Fathers tell us, that the seed of a glorious resurrection is

[1] Immediate non attingitur ab ullo sensu, nec ab ipsa mente, nisi per fidem. . . Concedo, sola fide sine reali præsentia corpus Domini apprehensum prodesse, et contra solo corpore per realem præsentiam acceptum nihil prodesse. Bellarm. De Euch. iii. 9. Op. ed. cit. iii. 601.

[2] Cum cogitamus reipsa nobiscum uniri Christum, quam si solum in cœlo eum sedere credamus. Id. ib. col. 599.

[3] Id. ib. col. 601.

given to our bodies through their conjunction with Christ's Body, are evidently valueless; because a conjunction by which Christ's body lies for a little time in our stomachs without acting at all upon us, is clearly not the conjunction of which these Fathers speak.

And in fact Cyril himself elsewhere expressly couples faith with the Eucharist as necessary for making man concorporal with Christ. For, after quoting the words of the Apostle, that we being many are one body, because we partake of one bread, he says,—

"Do you not know, that he says that the Gentiles are made concorporal with Christ as having obtained unity with him, to wit, through faith and the mystical Eucharist?"[1]

He does not suppose that the oral participation of the Eucharist would produce a corporal conjunction with Christ.

*Secondly,* Cyril speaks of Christians being *conjoined to one another in the same way;* which shows that it is no such conjunction of body with body as arises from eating with the bodily mouth that he refers to when he speaks of our being united bodily with Christ through the Eucharist.

In a passage, a portion of which the Archdeacon has himself quoted,[2] commenting on the words, "That they all may be one, as Thou, Father, art in me and I in Thee; that they also may be one in us" (John xvii. 21.), after speaking of the union of the faithful with one another resulting from their concordancy in mind and will, he adds,—

"But here we purpose to show, that there is also a natural unity, by which we are joined with one another, and all of us with God, not wanting perchance even a unity according to the body, I mean a unity one with another, although we are divided by a difference of bodies, each of us being confined to his own proper circumscription and substance. For Paul could not be or be called Peter, nor Peter on the other hand Paul, although by reason of the unity which is through Christ they both might be considered one. Therefore the natural unity between the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit being admitted (for one Godhead in the Holy Trinity is believed and

[1] Ἢ γὰρ οὐκ οἶσθα, ὅτι σύσσωμα γενέσθαι Χριστοῦ καὶ τὰ ἔθνη φησὶ, τὴν πρὸς αὐτὸν ἑνότητα λαχόντα διὰ τῆς πίστεως, δῆλον δὲ, ὅτι καὶ μυστικῆς εὐλογίας; Cyrill. Alex. De Sancta Trin. Dial. 1. Op. v. pt. 1. p. 407.

[2] Wilb. On Euch. p. 169; or, 3rd ed. p. 145.

glorified) let us now consider, in what way we also are found to be one with each other, both bodily and spiritually, and with God."

He then proceeds to speak of the incarnation of Christ, and to show how that event has united us to God, and made us partakers of the Divine nature, through our having the Holy Spirit communicated to us; and he then subjoins the following:—

"Therefore, in order that we ourselves may be united with each other, and commingled together in a unity like that we have with God, although differing each from the other both in our souls and bodies, the Only-begotten contrived a certain plan, discovered by that wisdom that belongs to Him and the counsel of the Father. For by one body, to wit his own, blessing those that believe on Him, through a mystical participation he makes them concorporal with himself and with one another. For who could divide or separate from a natural union with one another those who through the one holy body are joined to that unity which is in Christ? For if we all partake of the one bread, we are all made one body. For Christ cannot be divided."

And shortly afterwards he adds,—

"For as *the virtue of the holy flesh* makes those in whom it may exist concorporal, in the same way, I think, the one indivisible spirit of God dwelling in all leads all to a spiritual unity."[1]

[1] Ἐν δὲ τούτοις ἤδη πως καὶ φυσικὴν τὴν ἑνότητα δεικνῦναι σπουδάζομεν, καθ' ἣν ἡμεῖς τε ἀλλήλοις καὶ οἱ πάντες Θεῷ συνδούμεθα, οὐδὲ τῆς ἑνότητος τῆς κατὰ σῶμα λειπόμενοι τάχα, φημὶ δὲ τῆς εἰς ἀλλήλους, εἰ καὶ τῇ τῶν σωμάτων διαφορᾷ διεστήκαμεν, ἑκάστου τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς πρὸς ἰδίαν ἀναχωροῦντος περιγραφὴν καὶ ὑπόστασιν. Οὐ γὰρ ἂν εἴη τε καὶ λέγοιτο τυχὸν Παῦλος μὲν ὁ Πέτρος, Πέτρος δὲ αὖ πάλιν ὁ Παῦλος, εἰ καὶ τῷ τρόπῳ τῆς διὰ Χριστὸν ἑνώσεως ἓν ἄμφω νοοῖντο. Οὐκοῦν ὁμολογουμένης τῆς φυσικῆς ἑνότητος, ἐπί τε Πατρὸς καὶ Υἱοῦ, δῆλον δὲ ὅτι καὶ ἁγίου Πνεύματος· μία γὰρ θεότης ἐν ἁγίᾳ τριάδι πιστεύεται καὶ δοξάζεται· φέρε δὴ πάλιν διασκεπτώμεθα, κατὰ τίνα τρόπον καὶ ἡμεῖς αὐτοὶ καὶ πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἓν σωματικῶς τε καὶ πνευματικῶς καὶ πρὸς Θεὸν εὑρισκόμεθα. . . . . "Ινα τοίνυν εἰς ἑνότητα τὴν ὡς πρὸς Θεὸν καὶ ἀλλήλους συνίωμέν τε καὶ συναναμισγώμεθα καὶ ἡμεῖς αὐτοὶ, καίτοι τῇ καθ' ἕκαστον νοουμένῃ διαφορᾷ διεστηκότες εἰς ἰδίοτητα καὶ ψυχαῖς καὶ σώμασιν, ἐμηχανήσατό τινα τρόπον ὁ Μονογενὴς, διὰ τῆς αὐτῷ πρεπούσης ἐξηυρημένον σοφίας, καὶ βουλῆς τοῦ Πατρός. Ἑνὶ γὰρ σώματι, τῷ ἰδίῳ δηλαδὴ, τοὺς εἰς αὐτὸν πιστεύοντας εὐλογῶν, διὰ τῆς μυστικῆς μεταλήψεως, ἑαυτῷ τε συσσώμους καὶ ἀλλήλοις ἀποτελεῖ. Τίς γὰρ ἂν καὶ διέλοι καὶ τῆς εἰς ἀλλήλους φυσικῆς ἑνώσεως ἐξοικιεῖ, τοὺς δι' ἑνὸς τοῦ ἁγίου σώματος πρὸς ἑνότητα τὴν εἰς Χριστὸν ἀναδεσμουμένους; εἰ γὰρ οἱ πάντες ἐκ τοῦ ἑνὸς ἄρτου μετέχομεν, ἓν οἱ πάντες ἀποτελούμεθα σῶμα· μερίζεσθαι γὰρ οὐκ ἐνδέχεται τὸν Χριστόν. . . . . "Ωσπερ γὰρ τῆς ἁγίας σαρκὸς ἡ δύναμις συσσώμους ἀποτελεῖ τοὺς ἐν οἷς ἂν γένοιτο, τὸν αὐτὸν οἶμαι τρόπον ἐν τὸ ἐν πᾶσιν ἀμέριστον ἐνοικῆσαν Πνεῦμα Θεοῦ πρὸς ἑνότητα τὴν πνευματικὴν συνάγει τοὺς πάντας. CYRILL. ALEX. In Johann. lib. xi. Op. iv. 997—1000.

And again elsewhere, in another treatise, in a passage also quoted by the Archdeacon,[1] we have the following statement :— After quoting the words of the Apostle, "The cup of blessing which we bless, &c. . . . . For we being many are one bread and one body, for we are all partakers of that one bread," he says,—

"For, having been made partakers of the Holy Spirit, we are united both to Christ the Saviour of all and to one another. But we are concorporal in this way,—because there is one bread, we being many are one body; for we are all partakers of that one bread. For the body of Christ in us binds us together into unity, and that body is in no way divided into parts." [2]

Now the reason here assigned for our being *concorporal with one another*, and having a "*natural* unity" with one another, is, that a certain virtue or efficacy derived from Christ's body dwells *in all of us*. In whatever way we become possessed of this virtue, *the possession of it*, he tells us, makes us concorporal with each other. We become concorporal with each other, therefore, without any bodily commixture of our bodies with each other, which, in fact, in such a case is impossible; but simply from the virtue of Christ's body dwelling in all of us.

Consequently, according to Cyril, if the virtue or efficacy of the flesh of Christ dwells in us, we are concorporal with Christ, conjoined corporally with him, without any real *bodily conjunction* of our body with his body by oral reception.

And when he tells us, that we are concorporal with Christ just in the same way as we are concorporal with one another, this clearly indicates that no *such* bodily conjunction was in his mind.

And so we find other Fathers speaking of our being concorporal with Christ and with each other through the Eucharist, without any notion of *such* bodily conjunction.

Thus, Primasius says, that as the bread which we break in the Eucharist is the communion of the body of the Lord, "so also

[1] Wilb. on Euch., p. 105; or, 3rd ed. p. 90.

[2] Πνεύματος μὲν γὰρ τοῦ ἁγίου μετεσχηκότες, αὐτῷ τε τῷ πάντων σωτῆρι Χριστῷ καὶ ἀλλήλοις ἑνούμεθα· σύσσωμοι δὲ κατὰ τοῦτον ἐσμὲν τὸν τρόπον, ὅτι εἷς ἄρτος, ἓν σῶμα οἱ πολλοί ἐσμεν· οἱ γὰρ πάντες ἐκ τοῦ ἑνὸς ἄρτου μετέχομεν. Σύνδεῖ γὰρ ἡμᾶς εἰς ἑνότητα τὸ ἐν ἡμῖν σῶμα Χριστοῦ, μεμέρισται δὲ κατ' οὐδένα τρόπον. Cyrill. Alex. Adv. Nestor. lib. iv. Op. tom. vi. p. 111.

the bread of idols is the communion of devils," and that as we being many are one bread and one body, because we are all partakers of one bread, "so also if we eat of the same bread with idolaters, we are made *one body with them*." [1]

And similarly (though without any special reference to the Eucharist) Ambrose says,—

"We shall be one in Christ through the virtue [*i. e.*, as the context shows, the Divine virtue dwelling in the Son] received and dwelling in us." [2]

And we must observe, that here also Cyril uses the term "*natural* unity;" which shows that in the former passage he did not mean a unity produced by the reception of the body of Christ into the mouth.

In fact, he has himself elsewhere explained what he means by the phrase *natural unity*. For when the Eastern Bishops objected to his maintaining, in his third anathema against Nestorius, that our Lord's human and Divine nature were joined in his Person "by a natural union," [3] he replies, that by "*a natural union*" he meant "*a true union*," "not confounding the natures or mingling them with one another." [4] And he gives the same answer to Theodoret. [5]

*Thirdly*, we may observe in a passage just quoted, that he limits the bodily union of which he speaks to *believers*. "Those that believe on him," are those whom he makes "concorporal with himself and with each other," through the participation of the Eucharist. In fact, the bodily union of which he speaks can be of *believers only*, because its cause is that participation of the life-giving efficacy of Christ's Body which it is admitted that none but believers have.

[1] "Panis quem frangimus, nonne participatio corporis Domini est?" Sic et idolorum panis dæmonum participatio est. "Quoniam unus panis et unum corpus multi sumus, omnes qui de uno pane participamus." Sic et si de eodem pane manducamus unde idololatræ, unum cum illis corpus efficimur. PRIMAS. Comment. in 1 Ep. ad Cor. cap. x. Biblioth. Patr. Lat. ed. Migne, tom. lxviii. col. 530.

[2] Nos autem per acceptam et inhabitantem in nobis virtutem unum erimus in Christo. AMBROS. De fide, lib. iv. c. 3. Op. ii. 527.

[3] Καθ' ἕνωσιν φυσικὴν. CYRILL. ALEX. Apol. adv. Orient. Op. vi. 163.

[4] Εἰ δὲ δὴ λέγοιμεν φυσικὴν τὴν ἕνωσιν, τὴν ἀληθῆ φαμὲν .... οὐ συγχέοντες τὰς φύσεις, οὔτε μὴν ἀλλήλαις αὐτὰς ἀναφύροντες. ID. ib. p. 167.

[5] ID. Pro. xii. capit. adv. Theodoret. ib. p. 212.

And by the branches who are united bodily to the Vine Christ, he understands *the faithful only*. For he says that Christ compares those to branches who have been made partakers of his nature through a participation of the Holy Spirit.[1]

Now if, as the Archdeacon would have us suppose, Cyril held that the real Body of Christ was present in, or under the form of, the bread, and meant by what he calls our being united bodily to Christ to indicate our reception of the real Body of Christ by our bodily mouth, he would not have limited it to *believers;* for according to such a notion of the presence of Christ in the Eucharist, all who receive it are corporally conjoined to him.

And he intimates that the Gentiles are concorporal and copartakers of Christ when filled with spiritual light, "the day dawning and the day-star arising in their hearts," in the language of St. Peter.[2]

*Fourthly*, he expressly speaks of faith as, of itself, uniting us to the human nature of Christ, and making us concorporal with him. For he says that "to be received by Christ through a sincere and true faith, this would be to be reckoned for the future among the branches that grow on the true Vine, Christ."[3]

And we have already seen,[4] that Chrysostom uses the same language, saying that we are concorporal with Christ through faith.

Again, he says, speaking of the Eucharist,—

"He [Nestorius] does not understand, that showing forth the death of Christ, and also confessing his resurrection, and through this obtaining the perfection that is by faith, and hereupon having become partakers of his Divine nature, we are also through our participation

[1] Cyrill. Alex. In Joann. lib. x. iv. 857. See p. 429 above.

[2] Σύσσωμα δὲ καὶ συμμέτοχα γέγονε τὰ ἔθνη Χριστοῦ, γράφει δὲ πάλιν ὁ θεσπέσιος Παῦλος. Σύσσωμα δὲ καὶ συμμέτοχα γέγονε τὰ ἔθνη φωτὸς, δηλονότι τοῦ νοητοῦ, προσαναπιμπλάμενα, διαυγαζούσης ἡμέρας καὶ φωσφόρου κατὰ νοῦν ἀνατέλλοντος, ἔφη γάρ τις τῶν τοῦ Σωτῆρος μαθητῶν. Cyrill. Alex. De adorat. in spir. et ver. lib. x. Op. i. pt. 2. p. 336.

[3] Πρῶτον μὲν ἔργον σπουδῆς .... τὸ εἰσδεχθῆναι διὰ τῆς πίστεως τῆς εἰλικρινοῦς τε καὶ ἀληθοῦς παρὰ Χριστοῦ. Τουτὶ γὰρ ἂν εἴη τὸ ἀριθμεῖσθαι λοιπὸν ἐν κλήμασι τοῖς τῇ ἀμπέλῳ προσπεφυκόσι τῇ ἀληθινῇ, φημὶ δὴ Χριστῷ. Cyrill. Alex. In Johan. lib. x. iv. p. 874.

[4] See p. 376 above.

of unity with him both spiritually and bodily sanctified and vivified. For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality." [1]

Fifthly, he distinctly ascribes our reception of and union with Christ in his human as well as his divine nature, and the effects of that reception and union, to the operation of the Holy Spirit.

Thus he says,—

"For our Lord Jesus Christ nourishes us, not by giving us manna, the object of the senses, as he did of old to the Israelites, but by causing himself to dwell in the hearts of the faithful through the Holy Spirit. Wherefore also he said to the people of the Jews, 'Verily, verily, I say unto you, Moses gave you not the true bread from heaven; for the bread of God is he that comes down from heaven, and gives life to the world;' and again, 'I am the bread of life.'" [2]

Again,—

"Christ is in us through his own flesh vivifying us by the Spirit." [3]

"Whole Christ dwells in each of us by our participation of the Holy Spirit." [4]

"He speaks of those as branches who are united to him, and in a manner ingrafted and inserted into him, and have been made partakers of his own nature, through a participation of the Holy Spirit. For that which unites us to our Saviour Christ is his Holy Spirit." [5]

"For just as the root of the vine administers and distributes to the branches the enjoyment of that natural quality that belongs to it, so the only-begotten Word of God brings the saints into relationship as it were with his own nature and that of God the

[1] Σὺνίησι γὰρ οὐδαμῶς, ὅτι τὸν θάνατον καταγγέλλοντες τοῦ Χριστοῦ, προσομολογοῦντες δὲ τὴν ἀνάστασιν, καὶ τὴν ἐν πίστει τελείωσιν διὰ τούτου κερδαίνοντες, εἶτα τῆς θείας αὐτοῦ φύσεως κοινωνοὶ γεγονότες, καὶ διὰ τοῦ μεταλαχεῖν τῆς πρὸς αὐτὸν ἑνότητος, πνευματικῶς τε ἅμα καὶ σωματικῶς ἁγιαζόμεθα καὶ ζωοποιούμεθα. Δεῖ γὰρ τὸ φθαρτὸν τοῦτο ἐνδύσασθαι ἀφθαρσίαν, καὶ τὸ θνητὸν τοῦτο ἐνδύσασθαι ἀθανασίαν. CYRILL. ALEX. Adv. Nestor. lib. iv. c. 6. Op. vi. 115.

[2] Τρέφει γὰρ ἡμᾶς ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν Ιησοῦς Χριστὸς, οὐ μάννα τὸ αἰσθητὸν καθιείς, καθὰ καὶ πάλαι τοῖς ἐξ Ισραήλ· ἀλλ' ἑαυτὸν ταῖς τῶν πιστευόντων ἐνοικίζων ψυχαῖς διὰ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος. Τοιγάρτοι καὶ ἔφασκε, κ. τ. λ. CYRILL. ALEX. Glaph. in Gen. lib. vii. Op. i. 232.

[3] See p. 430 above. [4] Ib. [5] See p. 430 above.

Father, giving them the Spirit, that is, to those who are joined to him by faith and all holiness." [1]

And, as we have seen, Cyril held that our Lord was referring in this parable to our union with his human nature.

And he expressly attributes that gift of incorruption which the Archdeacon ascribes to our reception of the flesh of Christ, and which is frequently ascribed to this by the Fathers, to Christ being in us *by the Spirit*. He says,—

"For Christ is in us by the Spirit, changing that which was by nature corruptible into incorruption, and transforming that which was mortal into that which is immortal." [2]

And he speaks of Christ's presence within us as the bread represented by the manna, as "by the powerful operation of the Spirit giving life to our spirit, and not only that, but preserving our body itself for incorruption." [3]

And again he says,—

"Therefore the Father leads to the Son, through knowledge and contemplation suitable to divine things, those to whom he may have determined to give Divine grace. But the Son having received them vivifies them, and, having introduced into those who are naturally born to corruption his own virtue, and *having infused into them the life-giving power of the Spirit, as sparks of fire*, transforms them wholly and entirely to immortality." [4]

And these passages we must connect with those numerous passages of Cyril in which he maintains the *absence* of Christ's Body from the earth, and his distinct assertion that "Christ's Spirit dwelling in the saints *supplies the place of the presence and power of Christ*." [5]

Sixthly, like other Fathers, he tells us that men are made partakers of the holy flesh of Christ by baptism.[6]

And this is a complete answer to the Archdeacon's attempt to draw a distinction from Cyril, between Baptism as a union

[1] See p. 429 above. [2] Ib. [3] See p. 431 above.

[4] Προσάγει μὲν οὖν ὁ Πατὴρ διὰ γνώσεως καὶ θεοπρεποῦς θεωρίας τῷ υἱῷ, τοὺς οἷς ἂν τὴν θείαν ἐπιψηφίσαιτο χάριν. Ζωοποιεῖ δὲ λαβὼν ὁ υἱὸς, καὶ τὸ ἴδιον ἀγαθὸν τοῖς ἐξ οἰκείας φύσεως καταφθείρεσθαι πεφυκόσιν ἐντιθεὶς, καὶ καθάπερ σπινθῆρας πυρὸς ἐγκαταχύσας αὐτοῖς τὴν ζωοποιὸν τοῦ Πνεύματος δύναμιν, ὅλους δι' ὅλου μεταπλάττει πρὸς ἀθανασίαν. CYRILL. ALEX. In Johan. lib. iv. Op. iv. 340.

[5] See p. 304 above. [6] See p. 328 above.

with his *Person*, and the Eucharist as a reception of his *Body*.[1] A union with our Lord's *Person*, indeed, includes a union with his *Body*. And the difference between Baptism and the Eucharist is merely this, that the one is the formal act of union with the Body of Christ, the insertion of the graft into the Vine, and the other the feeding, as it were, of the branch on the root, or the reception of the life-giving virtue that dwells in Christ.

His object is to show, that the presence of Christ in Baptism is only by the Spirit, by which it may be said that he is present in *person*, but that in the Eucharist his *body* is present. But neither of the passages he adduces tends in the slightest degree to show this. The first (in Johan. Op. iv. 1086.) speaks of Baptism, which unites us to Christ, being the proper preparation for the reception of his body in the Eucharist; which no doubt it is, as the insertion of the graft is the proper preparation for its deriving nourishment from the root; and the second says, that "the force of the mystical Eucharist arises to us from his sacred flesh;" which no doubt is the case, as the life of the graft is drawn from the root into which it is inserted. And, in fact, this passage, *with its context*, would be as good evidence that the power of Baptism proceeded from the Body of Christ. For it tells us that the blood and water which flowed from our Lord's pierced side were the image and first-fruits of the mystical Eucharist and holy Baptism;[2] and then follows the passage quoted by the Archdeacon:—"For holy Baptism is truly Christ's and from Christ, and the force of the mystical Eucharist arises to us from his sacred flesh." But the *water* was from our Lord's flesh as well as the blood.

Lastly, in another passage he uses words which show that he must either be understood as supposing that our Lord's flesh is present in a *material* form (which, I suppose, no one will charge him with holding), or that he considered the bread as being *to us* the Lord's body, *only as being effectual* for bringing us into communion with it. For he says, in reply to Nestorius, that according to his doctrine there would be little profit in partaking of the Eucharist, "because it is not in our power to eat the

[1] Wilb. On Euch. p. 269; or, 3rd ed. p. 231.

[2] Τῆς μυστικῆς εὐλογίας καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου βαπτίσματος εἰκόνα καὶ ἀπαρχήν. Cyrill. Alex. In Johan. lib xii. Op. iv. 1074.

"nature of the divinity together with the flesh, for we cannot "do what is impossible and eat that which is altogether incor- "poreal. And you seem to me to have forgotten, that it is by "no means the nature of the Divinity that lies upon the holy "tables of our churches, but the proper body of the Word that "was born of God the Father. But the Word is by nature and "truly God."[1]

Now the doctrine of the Authors under review is precisely that which Cyril here says is an *impossible* thing, namely, that we eat that which is *immaterial*. For, not daring to say that the flesh of Christ is present in its natural form, they resort to the notion that it is present in a *spiritual* and *immaterial* form, and is eaten in that form. Certainly, therefore, Cyril did not hold their view. And as I suppose it will be admitted, that he did not hold that the flesh of Christ was present in its natural form, the conclusion as to his real view seems obvious. And consequently, when he says that "the proper body of the Word" lies upon the tables of our churches, he must be understood as meaning that it lies there by its effectual symbol and representative.

And the context confirms this conclusion; for in the passage of Nestorius, on which he was commenting, occur these words respecting the bread of the Eucharist,—"the bread *of which the Body is the antitype;*"[2] *which expression Cyril repeats, and raises no objection to it.*

Nevertheless this very passage is quoted by Archdeacon Wilberforce as supporting his own view.[3]

If we were to interpret literally the language sometimes used by Cyril, we must suppose that he considered our Lord's Body to be present in a material form, capable of being seen and handled. But such an interpretation would be at complete variance with his own statements elsewhere, as already quoted

[1] Ὅτι τάχα που μὴ γέγονεν ἐφικτὸν ὁμοῦ τῇ σαρκὶ καὶ τὴν τῆς θεότητος δαπανᾶσθαι φύσιν· ὅτι μὴ τῶν ἀμηχάνων κεκρατήκαμεν, ἐδεστὸν ἔχοντες γυμνὸν τὸ ἀσώματον. Ἐπιλελῆσθαι δέ μοι δοκεῖς, ὡς ἥκιστα μὲν θεότητος φύσις ἐστὶ τὸ προκείμενον ἐν ἁγίαις τραπέζαις ἐκκλησιῶν, πλὴν ἴδιον σῶμα τοῦ ἐκ Θεοῦ Πατρὸς φύντος Λόγου· Θεὸς δὲ φύσει καὶ ἀληθῶς ὁ Λόγος. CYRILL. ALEX. Adv. Nestor. lib. iv. Op. tom. vi. p. 116.

[2] Τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον, οὗ ἐστὶ τὸ σῶμα ἀντίτυπον. ID. ib. p. 115.

[3] WILB. On Euch. pp. 259, 260; or, 3rd ed. pp. 222, 223.

in a former part of this Chapter, and with those that occur in the immediate context of such passages. But, like other Fathers, while he holds that Christ's body is in heaven, and that there is no bodily presence of Christ now upon earth, he hesitates not to speak of the consecrated elements in the terms which belong to Christ's real body and blood, because they are effective symbols and representatives of that body and blood, bringing every faithful receiver of them into union and communion with that body and blood;—the true office of things appointed as a sacrament, which is—not to be turned into the things themselves, but—to be operative representatives of them.

For instance, let us take the following passage:—

"Most justly, therefore, do we call together holy assemblies in the churches on the eighth day, and if we have to speak anything of a more mysterious nature, on account of its being beyond the power of the understanding, we shut the doors. But Christ comes and appears to all of us, both invisibly and visibly; invisibly as God, but visibly also in body. And he permits and grants to us to touch his holy flesh. For by the grace of God we approach to the participation of the mystical Eucharist, receiving Christ into our hands; in order that we may firmly believe, that he has truly raised up his own temple [i. e. his body]. For that the participation [or, communion] of the mystical Eucharist is a certain confession of the resurrection of Christ, may clearly appear, and that beyond doubt, by what he himself said when he performed himself the type [or, example] of the mystery. For, having broken the bread, as it is written, he distributed it, saying, 'This is my body, &c. . . . Do this in remembrance of me.'" [1]

According to this statement, therefore, we both see and touch and receive into our hands the body of Christ. But do the Authors under review believe that this is the case, or that

[1] Εὐλογώτατα τοιγαροῦν τὰς ἁγίας συνόδους ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις ποιούμεθα κατὰ τὴν ὀγδόην· καὶ εἰ χρή τι καὶ μυστικώτερον εἰπεῖν, διὰ τὴν τῶν νοημάτων ἀπαραίτητον χρείαν, ἀποκλείομεν μὲν τὰς θύρας· ἐπιφοιτᾷ δὲ καὶ ἐπιφαίνεται πᾶσιν ἡμῖν ὁ Χριστὸς, ἀοράτως τε καὶ ὁρατῶς· ἀοράτως μὲν ὡς Θεὸς, ὁρατῶς δὲ πάλιν ἐν σώματι. Ἐπιτρέπει δὲ καὶ δίδωσι τῆς ἁγίας αὐτοῦ σαρκὸς ἀποθίγειν. Πρόσιμεν γὰρ κατὰ χάριν Θεοῦ τῇ μεθέξει τῆς μυστικῆς εὐλογίας, εἰς χεῖρας δεχόμενοι τὸν Χριστὸν, ἵνα καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀραρότως πιστεύσωμεν, ὅτι τὸν ἴδιον ἀληθῶς ἤγειρε ναόν. Ὅτι γὰρ ἡ κοινωνία τῆς μυστικῆς εὐλογίας ὁμολογία τίς ἐστι τῆς ἀναστάσεως τοῦ Χριστοῦ, σαφὲς ἂν γένοιτο, καὶ μάλα ῥᾳδίως, δι' ὧν αὐτὸς ἔφη τὸν τοῦ μυστηρίου τύπον ἐπιτελέσας δι' ἑαυτοῦ· διακλάσας γὰρ τὸν ἄρτον, καθὰ γέγραπται, διεδίδου, λέγων, κ. τ. λ. Cyrill. Alex. In Johan. lib. xii. Op. iv. 1104, 1105.

Cyril supposed this to be the case? Nothing of the kind. They believe that the material bread and wine only are seen and touched. What is the conclusion? I maintain that the legitimate conclusion is, that Cyril was speaking of the bread and wine as the symbols and representatives, effectual representatives through the Divine blessing and appointment, of the body and blood of Christ. The Authors under review, on the contrary, assert that he meant that Christ's body was really present in them *in an immaterial form*. And Archdeacon Wilberforce actually quotes this very passage as a proof that Cyril held, that the body of Christ is *orally* eaten by *all* the communicants.[1] I ask them to point out any evidence from Cyril's writings, that he held such a notion. And still further, I assert, that such a notion is directly contrary to Cyril's own statements in the context. For he says, only a few pages further on, that Christ "is no longer upon the earth bodily, but has ascended into heaven;"[2] which would be utterly untrue if his body was substantially present in a spiritual form on the communion-tables of our churches. Had he held their views, he must have drawn a distinction (as they do) both here and elsewhere,[3] between his bodily presence in a material form, and his bodily presence in a spiritual and immaterial form. But this he has not done, nor given the remotest hint that he held that Christ's body could be present in a spiritual form. On the contrary, it is clear from his language elsewhere, that he did not hold such a view. For, in the first place, he insists, in the very context of this passage, on the fact, that the body that rose from the grave was a material and not a spiritual body. For he says,—

"Wherefore, that none should suppose that the Lord had risen an immaterial Spirit, nor with an impalpable body, shadow-like and airy, which some are accustomed to call spiritual; but that the very

[1] Wilb. on Euch. p. 308; or, 3rd ed. p. 265.

[2] Οὐκ ὄντος μὲν ἐπὶ γῆς σωματικῶς ἔτι Χριστοῦ, ἀναβεβηκότος δὲ μᾶλλον εἰς οὐρανούς. Id. ib. p. 1110.

[3] See the various passages cited from him in p. 304 above, maintaining the *absence* of Christ's body from the earth, and his presence now to be only by his Divine power; to which may be added a similar striking passage in his Commentary on John xvii. 13 (Op. iv. 979), where he speaks of his absence according to the flesh (τὴν μετὰ σαρκὸς ἀποφοίτησιν) being compensated for by his presence by the power of the Godhead (τῇ τῆς θεότητος ἐξουσίᾳ).

body sown in corruption, as Paul says, might be believed to be raised, he did, and exhibited what belongs to a solid body." [1]

And elsewhere he uses language which entirely negatives the notion (so much insisted on by Archdeacon Wilberforce) that his body, being a body united to God the Word, is endued with capabilities, such as a power of multipresence, which no human body not so united could have. For he says, that the union which he speaks of as existing between the two natures in Christ "does not confound the natures, nor mix them, *so as to cause either to be different from what it is.*" [2]

And as a memorial of this body having risen, we take, he tells us, the mystical Eucharist. But the Eucharist is no memorial of such a body, if we take it as being Christ's body itself in a spiritual and immaterial form.

But all that is necessary to harmonize these passages and make the Fathers self-consistent in their statements, is, to realize *the fact*, that they used respecting the symbols, without hesitation, all the terms which would be applicable to the things which they represent, because by the Divine appointment and blessing they *are* in *character*, *use*, and *effect*, those very things themselves.

The same, however, has happened to Cyril in this case, which we see not unfrequently to happen to eager controversialists, namely, that in the vehemency of his zeal to overthrow the errors of Arius and Nestorius, he has used language not sufficiently guarded against other errors. In his eagerness to show how we derive spiritual life from union with our Lord's human nature (in order, in the case of Arius, to subvert his interpretation of John xv. 1, and in that of Nestorius to prove the hypostatical union of Christ's human nature with the Divine Word,) he uses language respecting the union of our bodies with Christ's, which, taken as it stands, would clearly

[1] Οὐκοῦν ἵνα μὴ πνεῦμα λεπτὸν οἴωνταί τινες ἐγηγέρθαι τὸν Κύριον, μήτε μὴν ἀνέπαφον σῶμα, σκιοειδές τε καὶ ἀέριον, ὅπερ ἔθος τισὶν ὀνομάζειν πνευματικὸν, ἀλλ' αὐτὸ δὴ τοῦτο τὸ ἐσπαρμένον ἐν φθορᾷ κατὰ τὴν τοῦ Παύλου φωνὴν διαναστὰν πιστεύηται, τὰ σώματι πρέποντα τῷ παχεῖ δέδρακέ τε καὶ δέδειχεν. Id. ib. p. 1109.

[2] Οὐ συγχέουσα τὰς φύσεις, οὔτε μὴν ἀνακιρνῶσα, πρός γε τὸ δεῖν ἑκατέρου ἑτεροίως ἔχειν ἢ ὅπερ ἐστί. Cyrill. Alex. Pro. xii. capit. adv. Theodoret. Op. vi. 212.

lead to the error of the Capernaites; a mistake into which Archdeacon Wilberforce admits that Anastatius Sinaita fell from a similar cause.[1]

I believe that in the foregoing remarks I have noticed all the arguments of importance derived from Cyril's testimony by Archdeacon Wilberforce, and therefore it is unnecessary to detain the reader by replying in detail to every reference he has made to the works of Cyril.[2]

The passages of Cyril, already considered, so fully express all that can be gathered from his works that might seem to favor the doctrine of the Authors under review, that it is unnecessary to go through all the others that have been thrown together by Dr. Pusey. But I must add, that some of Dr. Pusey's own extracts are anything but favorable to his view of Cyril's sentiments.

For instance, the following:—"The tongue of the dogs—again the unclean heathen—tasted the Undefiled Blood, *when they turned to Him from the devil.*"[3]

One remark more I would make in connexion with these statements of Cyril, and that is, that it may perhaps be admitted, that, in recent times, the idea of that union—the union of our souls and bodies—with our Lord's human nature, of which Cyril speaks, and of the effects which he attributes to that union, has been too much lost sight of. This admission may be made without giving the slightest sanction to the Archdeacon's statements on the subject. For, in fact, the view to which I allude was advocated in the strongest terms, as the Archdeacon himself has pointed out, by Calvin. And I will here give the passage which the Archdeacon has quoted from Calvin, and according to his translation of it:—

"I interpret," says Calvin, "as St. Cyril does, the words of Christ,

[1] Wilb. On Euch. p. 125; or, 3rd ed. pp. 106, 107.

[2] Other references to the works of Cyril will be found in Archdeacon Wilberforce's book, at pp. 79, 80; 90; 99; 101; 189; 207—209; 215; 217; 324, 325. Those noticed occur in pp. 103; 105; 110, 111; 156, 157; 159; 161, 162; 168, 169; 233; 259, 260; 261; 269; 287; 308; 329, 330; 337, 338.

[3] Cyrill. Alex. In Ps. lxvii. 24. Mai. Bibl. Nov. ii. 386, as quoted by Dr. Pusey, p. 620.

'as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself.' In this passage our Lord does not speak so much of those gifts which he had from the beginning with the Father, as of those with which he was endowed in that flesh in which he appeared. He showed, therefore, that the fulness of life dwelt in his humanity also, so that whosoever should communicate in his flesh and blood, would at the same time enjoy the participation of life. This may be illustrated by a familiar example. A fountain may supply water to those who drink, or those who draw, or those who would irrigate their fields; but it is not from itself that it derives such exuberance as may answer their several wants, but because the spring is furnishing a perpetual stream whereby it is ever replenished. In like manner Christ's flesh is as it were a wealthy and exhaustless fountain, whereby that life which dwells in Deity as its source is transferred into us. Who does not see, then, that the communion of the flesh and blood of Christ is necessary to all who aspire to the heavenly life? To this refer those dicta of the Apostle, that the Church is 'Christ's Body,' 'the fulness of him that filleth all in all;' that 'He is the Head, from whom the whole body by joints and bands maketh increase, having nourishment ministered;' that our bodies are the 'members of Christ.' Now all these cannot take effect, unless He is wholly united to us, both in spirit and body. Yet the Apostle goes on to draw more closely the bonds by which we are united to his flesh, and to illustrate this truth in still more splendid terms, when he says, that 'we are members of his body, of his flesh and of his bones.' In fine, that he might declare the thing to be beyond expression, he breaks forth into an exclamation: 'this is a great mystery!' It would be madness, therefore, to deny, that the faithful have communion with the body and blood of Christ, when the Apostle declares it to be so intimate a communion, that he can rather wonder at than explain it." [1]

And in the context of this passage, Calvin justly takes exception to the statements of those who make the eating the flesh of Christ and drinking his blood, merely believing in him; and points out, that though there is no other eating and drinking but of faith, yet that this eating and drinking are acts of faith distinct from, and consequent upon, the act of believing in Christ.

[1] Calvin. Instit. iv. 17. 9. as cited by Wilb. on Euch. p. 325, or, 3rd ed. pp. 279, 280.

There may be too low and superficial notions of the nature and effects of the Lord's Supper, as well as too mystical. And the words of Holy Scripture clearly point to something much more than a mere act of belief in Christ, when speaking of our eating his flesh and drinking his blood, and being united to Him.

And this union with Christ, though produced by the acts of faith and the operation of the Holy Spirit through the medium of the soul (as Archdeacon Wilberforce allows), affects the body as well as the soul. Let a man, for instance, receive the sacramental body and blood of Christ in humble and sincere *faith*, and he may hope that *such* a reception of what is, by Divine appointment, in operation and effect, Christ's Body and Blood, will have an effect upon the body as well as the soul, and impart to the whole man a principle of spiritual life. But it is only by him whose soul receives that body and blood in faith, that such an effect will be experienced. It is only to him that the sacramental body and blood become, in operation and effect, the true body and blood of Christ. And to him *in operation and effect alone.* They are not *turned into the reality, or compounded into one whole with the reality,* even in his case. But they *operate* so as to bring the soul into communion with the reality. And this operation is produced through the agency of the Holy Spirit, who *makes them* such to us. Hence the prayer that the Holy Spirit would make the bread and wine the body and blood of Christ to the communicants; not by introducing into them the reality, so that the real body and blood might be swallowed by the mouth, (a gross and sensual and earthly notion,) but by making them such to the faithful communicants in the effects they produce. Cyril evidently held, that as a blessing attended those who touched our Lord's body when he was upon earth, exercising at the same time faith in him, so the consecrated elements were given to us, in Christ's absence, as, representatively, and also in operation and effect, his body and blood, that we might, by eating and drinking them in the exercise of faith, receive not merely the same, but greater blessings than those who touched him when upon earth; because his glorified body has become, since his ascension, enriched with greater gifts and powers than it possessed in his state of voluntary humiliation on earth.

But, as it was when he was upon earth, that the gift was given to faith, and through an act of faith, so it is now. When the multitude thronged about him and pressed him, there was but one that *touched* him spiritually, and to her the virtue passed from his body.

And as the Fathers considered the consecrated elements to be, in character, operation, and effect, the effectual representatives of his body and blood, and also, on that account, and from his own words, to be called *by the name* of his body and blood, they spoke freely of our seeing and handling and tasting and eating his body in the Eucharist.

To one unacquainted with the phraseology of the Fathers, such language might appear to imply some such doctrine as that of the Authors under review. But when we compare it with the doctrine held by Cyril on various points connected with the subject, as above pointed out, and the doctrine of the Fathers generally, and their mode of speaking of the sacramental signs, we see at once, that he meant no such notion. In fact, the expressions are such as can only be applied to the signs, for all admit that our Lord's body and blood are *not* present so as to be the objects of any of the senses.

## Hilary of Poictiers. (fl. a. 354.)

I have delayed the consideration of Hilary's statements[1] till after the examination of those of Cyril of Alexandria, on account of the similarity that exists between the two, and the necessity for a full investigation of those of Cyril, as being the statements on which Archdeacon Wilberforce seems principally to rely for the maintenance of his doctrine. And as I trust we have ascertained the meaning of Cyril in the passages referred to, it will not be necessary to dwell long on the similar statements of Hilary. Like Cyril, and with a similar view of raising an argument against the Arians, he insists very strongly in one

[1] For the quotations from Hilary made by the Authors under review, see Wilb. On the Euch. pp. 156; 158, 159; 199; 336, 337; or, 3rd ed. pp. 133; 136; 170; 290. Pusey, Notes to Sermon, pp. 393—399.

place upon the corporal and natural union that exists between Christ and the believer. And his statements on this point are, of course, eagerly caught at (though, I think, inconsiderately) by all who hold that the Body of Christ is swallowed by the mouth, as supporting their view. They occur in his reply to the Arian exposition of the passage, "I and the Father are one," which the Arians interpreted as meaning, one through a concord of will, not one by nature, or as having a natural unity; just as it is said, that "the multitude of them that believed were of one heart and of one soul," (Acts iv. 32,) and that "he that planteth and he that watereth are one." (1 Cor. iii. 8.)

Hilary first points out, that even among believers there is a *natural unity*, and not merely a unity from a concord of wills; and this on various grounds, namely, from the faith of all being one,[1] and from all being similarly regenerated,[2] and all baptized with one baptism, and thus having put on one Christ.[3] So that we may see at once, that he uses the phrase *natural unity* (as Cyril does) to signify a true and real unity, even from *spiritual* causes.

He then proceeds to refer to our Lord's words, "That they may be one, as we are one; I in them and Thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one." And in order to prove the character of the unity that exists between Christ and the Father, alluded to in these words, he endeavours to show the character of the unity that exists between Christ and the believer; which in these words our Lord prays may be of a similar kind. And he argues thus:—

"Now I ask those who insist upon a unity of will between the Father and Son, whether at this day Christ is in us by the truth of

[1] Si ergo per fidem, id est, per unius fidei naturam unum omnes erant, quomodo non naturalem in his intelligis unitatem, qui per naturam unius fidei unum sunt? Hilar. Pict. De Trin. lib. viii. § 7. Op. ed. cit. col. 951.

[2] Cessat in his assensûs unitas, qui unum sunt in ejusdem regeneratione naturæ. Id. ib.

[3] Quod unum sunt in tanta gentium, conditionum, sexuum diversitate, numquid ex assensu voluntatis est, aut ex sacramenti unitate, quia his et baptisma sit unum, et unum Christum induti omnes sunt? Quid ergo hic animorum concordia faciet, cum per id unum sint, quod uno Christo per naturam unius baptismi induantur. Id. ib. § 8. col. 952.

nature, or by concord of will? For if the Word is truly made flesh, and we truly take the Word made flesh by the Lord's food, how is he not to be thought to dwell naturally in us, who both when born as man took the nature of our flesh, which is now inseparable from him, and mingled the nature of his flesh with the nature of that which is eternal,—flesh to be given to us under the sacrament?[1] For thus we all are one, since both the Father is in Christ, and Christ is in us. Whoever therefore shall deny, that the Father is naturally in Christ, must first deny either that he himself is naturally in Christ or that Christ is in him, because the Father in Christ and Christ in us cause us to be one in them. If therefore Christ truly took the flesh of our body, and that man who was born of Mary is truly Christ, and we truly take the flesh of his body under a mystery, [or, mystically] (and through this we shall be one, because the Father is in him, and he in us,) how is a unity of will asserted, when the natural property [obtained] through the sacrament is a sacrament [or, bond] of a perfect unity?[2] . . . . Let us read what is written, and understand what we read; and then we shall perform the duty of a perfect faith. For what we say concerning Christ being truly in us by nature, unless we have learnt it from him, we say foolishly and impiously. But he himself says, 'My flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed. He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him.' Of the truth of the flesh and blood there is no room left for doubt. For now, both by the declaration of our Lord himself, and our faith, it is truly flesh and it is truly blood. And these being received and drank, cause both us to be in Christ, and Christ to be in us.[3] Is not this the truth? It may be no truth at

[1] Si enim vere Verbum caro factum est, et vere nos Verbum carnem cibo Dominico sumimus, quomodo non naturaliter manere in nobis existimandus est, qui et naturam carnis nostræ jam inseparabilem sibi homo natus assumsit, et naturam carnis suæ ad naturam æternitatis, sub sacramento nobis communicandæ carnis, admiscuit?—Dr. Pusey understands the last words of this sentence, (like the Benedictines apparently from their note on the passage,) as if they meant, that our Lord had mingled the nature of his flesh with the nature of the Godhead under the sacrament. But this could hardly be his meaning, as the union was quite independent of the sacrament. The words are certainly obscure, and the construction any way harsh, but I think the meaning is more likely to be what I have given in the translation above.

[2] Si vere igitur carnem corporis nostri Christus assumsit, et vere homo ille, qui ex Maria natus fuit, Christus est, nosque vere sub mysterio carnem corporis sui sumimus; (et per hoc unum erimus, quia Pater in eo est, et ille in nobis;) quomodo voluntatis unitas asseritur, cum naturalis per sacramentum proprietas perfectæ sacramentum sit unitatis.

[3] De veritate carnis et sanguinis non relictus est ambigendi locus. Nunc enim et ipsius Domini professione et fide nostra vere caro est, et vere sanguis est. Et

all to those who deny that Christ Jesus is the true God. He therefore is in us by the flesh, and we in him; while this which we are is with him in God. But how far we are in him through the sacrament of his communicated flesh and blood,[1] he himself testifies, saying, 'And here the world seeth me no more, but ye shall see me; because I live, ye shall live also; since I am in the Father, and ye in mẽ, and I in you.' If he wished a unity of will only to be understood, why did he set forth a certain gradation and order of the unity to be perfected; except that since he was in the Father by the nature of the divinity, we, on the other hand, might be believed to be in him by his bodily nativity, and he again to be present in us by the mystery of the sacraments;[2] and thus a perfect unity through the Mediator would be taught; since while we dwell in him, he himself would dwell in the Father, and he dwelling in the Father would dwell in us; and thus we should advance to the unity of the Father, since in him who is in the Father naturally by birth, we also are naturally, he himself dwelling in us naturally. But how far this unity is natural in us, he himself thus testifies: 'He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me and I in him.' For no one will be in him, except one in whom he himself shall be: having only the flesh of him who has taken his own flesh received into himself. But he had before taught the sacrament of this perfect unity, saying, 'As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father, so he that eateth my flesh, even he shall live by me.' Therefore he lives by the Father; and in the same manner in which he lives by the Father, do we live by his flesh .... This therefore is the cause of our life, that we have Christ dwelling in us, who are flesh, by the flesh; inasmuch as we live through him in the same way in which he lives through the Father. If therefore we live through him naturally, according to the flesh, that is, having obtained the nature of his flesh, how has he not the Father in himself naturally according to the Spirit, since he lives by the Father?[3] .... But we therefore notice these things,

hæc accepta atque hausta id efficiunt, ut et nos in Christo et Christus in nobis sit.—The phraseology here is similar to that he uses in his comment on the 64th Psalm, § 14. col. 169. "'Flumen Dei repletum est aqua,' &c. Et de flumine ambigendi locus nullus est."

[1] Per sacramentum communicatæ carnis et sanguinis.

[2] In nobis per sacramentorum inesse mysterium.

[3] Hæc ergo vitæ nostræ causa est, quod in nobis carnalibus manentem per carnem Christum habemus: victuris nobis per eum ea conditione qua vivit ille per Patrem. Si ergo nos naturaliter secundum carnem per eum vivimus, id est, naturam carnis suæ adepti, quomodo non naturaliter secundum Spiritum in se Patrem habeat, cum vivat ipse per Patrem?

because the heretics falsely asserting that there is only a unity of will between the Father and the Son, applied the example of our unity with God, as if we were united to the Son, and through the Son to the Father, only by the obedience and will of a religious fear, and that no property of natural communion through the sacrament of flesh and blood was granted;[1] when, both by the honor of the Son given to us, and by the Son dwelling in us carnally, and we being united in him corporally and inseparably, the mystery of a true and natural unity is to be preached."[2]

Now, in considering the force of this passage as evidence in favor of the doctrine here controverted, we must remember what the question at issue really is, namely, Whether the real flesh and blood of Christ are within, or under the form of, the consecrated bread and wine, and so swallowed by our mouths when receiving the consecrated food,—not whether the faithful eat and drink the flesh and blood of Christ in the sacrament, so that we are united to him corporally, and have him dwelling in us by a perfect union of our human nature with his human nature, and thus, in some sense, carnally and naturally. The latter is not questioned. And throughout this whole passage there is no statement to the effect that Christ's real body and blood are in the consecrated elements themselves, but only that they are in *us*. What is stated is, that "under a mystery," or "under the sacrament," we eat and drink his body and blood; about which there is no question. The only words that could seem to imply such a change in the elements are these:— "Of the truth of the flesh and blood there is no room left for "doubt. For now, both by the declaration of our Lord him- "self and our faith, it is truly flesh and it is truly blood. And "these being received and drank cause both us to be in Christ "and Christ to be in us." Archdeacon Wilberforce,[3] with the Romanists, asserts that these words apply to the consecrated

[1] Nulla per sacramentum carnis et sanguinis naturalis communionis proprietas.

[2] Cum et per honorem nobis datum Filii, et per manentem in nobis carnaliter Filium, et in eo nobis corporaliter et inseparabiliter unitis, mysterium veræ ac naturalis unitatis sit prædicandum. Hilarii Pictav. De Trin. lib. viii. §§ 13—17. Op. col. 954—957.

[3] "St. Hilary says, when treating of the Holy Eucharist, 'There is no room for doubting about the truth of his flesh and blood,' because Christ 'himself says, My flesh is meat indeed and my blood is drink indeed.'" Wilb. On Euch. p. 199; or, 3rd ed. p. 170. See also pp. 336, 337; or, 3rd ed. p. 290.

elements. But this is impossible, unless Hilary had embraced the Capernaite error, and then all parties must disown his view. For if the bread becomes or contains *true flesh*, and the wine becomes or contains *true blood*, then we receive Christ's material flesh and blood into our stomachs.

But the words refer to our Lord's declaration, "My flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed; he that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood dwelleth in me and I in him." And Hilary, wishing to prove our *natural unity with Christ*, says, that hence it appears, that it is *real flesh* and *real blood*, of which we eat and drink; and therefore he would infer, that the unity thus established between us and Christ is a natural unity, as being a unity between *our* real flesh and blood and *Christ's* real flesh and blood. But *how* we eat and drink that flesh and blood, except that we do so "under a mystery" and "under the sacrament," he does not state, as it did not enter into his argument.

And his words here are just what Cranmer himself used, and express only the doctrine he contended for, as we have already seen,[1] when he maintained, that it is "the *true, natural, and organical flesh*" of Christ of which we eat; and THEREFORE that it is NOT such a body as can be supposed to be in or with or under the form of the bread, and so orally received with it, but can be partaken of only by an act of the soul through faith. If it is *real flesh* and *real blood* of which we eat and drink in the sacrament, then all will admit, that that eating and drinking are *not* by the mouth of the body, but by a spiritual act, an act of the soul.

And further, that he was not speaking of the mere oral reception of the consecrated substances in this passage, is evident from the final words. For he says, "these being received and drank cause both us to be in Christ and Christ to be in us." But the mere reception of the consecrated substances, whatever they may be supposed to be, does not, as all admit, cause this. For a wicked man is not caused to be in Christ by receiving the sacrament. Nor can it indeed be said, that the reception of the sacrament causes even the believer to be *in* Christ, in that sense

[1] See p. 6 and 53 above.

of the word *in* according to which it is contended that Christ is *in us*, that is, *inside* the body of Christ.

And it is evident also, from other parts of the passage, that Hilary is speaking of *such* a reception of the flesh and blood of Christ as gives spiritual life. For he says, — "In the same manner in which he lives by the Father, do we live by his flesh. . . . . *This therefore is the cause of our life*, that we have Christ dwelling in us, who are flesh, by the flesh; inasmuch as we live through him in the same way in which he lives through the Father." But the mere oral reception of Christ's flesh and blood would, as all admit, produce no such result.

In fact, as I have already observed, when considering the statements of Cyril of Alexandria, the admission, both of the Romanists and of Archdeacon Wilberforce, that the Body of Christ, though received, according to their notion, into the stomach, has and can have no effect upon the recipient through such reception, but that the soul must be the medium through which any effect is produced, and that the soul apprehends the Body of Christ only through faith, entirely excludes them from availing themselves of such passages as these of Hilary to prove the reception of the Body of Christ by the mouth. For the very object which Hilary had in view was to prove a real union, and one which was *operative*. But no real operative union is caused by the Body of Christ coming into the stomach, and just remaining there until the bread and wine are gone and then leaving, and all the time not acting at all in any way upon the recipient. The corporal union, upon their own showing, must be through faith apprehending and feeding upon the Body of Christ, and the soul, thus spiritually nourished, imparting the life it has acquired to the body. The corporal union therefore is, to say the least, entirely independent of the reception of Christ's Body by the mouth into the stomach. And therefore these passages, asserting the corporal union, avail nothing to prove such reception. Our opponents must at any rate go elsewhere to obtain evidence in its favor. Before they can avail themselves of such passages as these, they must suppose that the Body of Christ, when received into the stomach, acts in a *direct way* upon the recipient; and not exclusively through the intervention of faith.

In fact, as we have already seen,[1] the phrases, *corporal union with Christ*, and being made *concorporal with Christ*, are used with reference to our union with Christ by faith, and by baptism, in which cases no one supposes any direct bodily conjunction; and therefore the use of such phrases with reference to the effects of the Eucharist is totally insufficient for the support of the doctrine under consideration.

The meaning, therefore, of Hilary, when he says that Christ is corporally and carnally in us through the Eucharist, is, that we are by an act of the soul made partakers of his human nature, united afresh, both as it respects our souls and bodies, to his body as living members, and thus that there is a natural corporal and carnal union between Christ and the believer, *not through corporal acts*, but (as Archdeacon Wilberforce himself says) through the medium of the soul and by the acts of the soul. And he calls it a natural corporal and carnal union, as a union of the human nature of Christ with our human nature, as distinguished from the union that also exists, through Christ, between our nature and the Divine nature.

That he does not mean any actual indwelling of Christ's real substantial body in us by the terms he uses, is clear from his saying, as well that we are naturally in Christ, as that Christ is naturally in us; while no one supposes that our bodies actually pass into the interior of Christ's real body.

I do not deny that such phraseology is dangerous, and open to misinterpretation, and the passage may be another illustration of the way in which eagerness to support an argument by the strongest possible statements often leads to the use of terms and phrases capable of an unorthodox interpretation in another direction. But that is a different question.

I must add also, that the language of Hilary on several points (one of which I shall notice presently) has been considered even by Romanists, if not clearly unorthodox, yet at least with difficulty reconcileable with orthodox views.[2]

[1] See pp. 374—381 above; and also the remarks just made on this point under Cyril of Jerusalem and Cyril of Alexandria.

[2] These points are noticed, and the best defence made for Hilary, in the Preface to the Benedictine edition of his Works.

The two other passages quoted by Archdeacon Wilberforce from Hilary, do not in the least bear out the statements he has grounded on them. They are cited by him for the purpose of showing that our Lord's Body is endowed with such peculiar properties, through its union with the Divine nature, that it may be present in the consecrated elements in the way he imagines; that is, that while it is in a material form in heaven, it may be also at the same time in an immaterial form in millions of places all over the earth. But the passages he has quoted from Hilary have not the remotest reference to such a notion. Hilary, commenting on the passage, "I am the living bread which came down from heaven," &c., and remarking that our Lord spoke of his having come down from heaven, even as man, on account of his having been conceived by the influence of the Holy Spirit, proceeds to speak of his human nature as not being subject to the influence of suffering as ours is, (in a way which many have considered far from orthodox,) and, with reference to *this point*, adds the words quoted by the Archdeacon, namely,—"That flesh, that is, that bread is from heaven; and that man is from God."[1] But the words have not the remotest reference to the point respecting which the Archdeacon quotes them. And the case is the same as it regards the other passage he has quoted, which, in fact, occurs just after the one above cited, and refers to the same point; being as follows;—"He had a Body, but one peculiar to its origin; not owing its existence to the faults of human corruption, but subsisting, in the form of our bodies, through the power of his own virtue."[2]

The doctrine which the Archdeacon wishes to establish upon the strength of those passages is not *touched* by them.

Of the additional passages quoted by Dr. Pusey, none, I conceive, can present any difficulty. In two of them the consecrated bread is spoken of (according to that custom of the Fathers of which we have had abundant proof of calling the signs by the names of the things signified) by the name of that

[1] Hilar. De Trin. x. 23. Op. col. 1051. Quoted in Wilb. On Euch. p. 156; or, 3rd ed., p. 133.

[2] Hilar. De Trin. x. 25. col. 1053. Quoted in Wilb. On Euch. pp. 158, 159; or, 3rd ed., p. 136.

which it represents; but this is a point which can hardly require further notice.

There is, however, one passage among those he has quoted which seems to me decidedly adverse to his doctrine, namely, the following:—

"'Give us this day our daily bread.' For what doth God so will, as that Christ should daily dwell in us, who is the Bread of life and the Bread from heaven? And because it is a daily prayer, daily also is it prayed that that Bread be given."[1]

Now it is clear, that these words do not refer, at any rate specially, to the Eucharist, because they are an interpretation of a clause in the Lord's Prayer. And consequently he held, that *the Bread of life* and *the Bread from heaven* was given and received independently of the Eucharist; and that it was to be daily *prayed for*, as something which might, or might not, be given by God.

Before I pass on to the next Author to be considered, it may be acceptable to some of my readers if I cite some of the remarks made by Bishop Jewel on the passages we have been reviewing from Cyril of Alexandria and Hilary, as quoted against him by his opponent Harding. He says,—

"Now at the last M. Harding draweth near the matter, and bringeth forth the old Fathers with these very terms, 'really,' 'substantially,' 'corporally,' 'carnally,' &c. And although these Fathers speak not any one word that is either denied by us, or anywise serveth to this purpose, yet he cunningly leadeth away the eyes of the ignorant with the show of old names .... For whereas he hath taken in hand to prove that Christ's body is really and fleshly[2] in the sacrament, he finding his weakness and want therein altereth the whole case, and proveth that Christ's body is really fleshly and naturally within us. But this matter was not in question, and therefore needeth no proof at all. .... But because M. Harding will hereof reason thus, If Christ's body by mean of the sacrament be really and carnally in us, it is likely the same body is also really and carnally in the sacrament: for answer hereunto, it shall be necessary first to understand how many ways Christ's body dwelleth in our bodies, and thereby afterward to view M. Harding's reason. Four special means there be whereby Christ dwelleth in us, and we in him: his nativity, whereby he embraced

[1] Hilar. Fragm. Op. col. 1367, 1368. Quoted by Dr. Pusey, p. 397.

[2] By *fleshly* here is meant only what the Authors under review mean, that is, flesh in a spiritual and supernatural form.

us; our faith, whereby we embrace him; the sacrament of baptism; and the sacrament of his body. By every of these means Christ's body dwelleth in our bodies; and that not by way of imagination, or by figure or fantasy; but really, naturally, substantially, fleshly, and indeed .... [He then shows that the Fathers use this language with respect to the first three of these "means;" and having done this proceeds to the fourth, in his remarks on which he says, respecting Cyril and Hilary,—] The greatest weight of this matter lieth upon two old Fathers, Cyril and Hilary. For Hilary saith: 'We receive Christ *vere sub mysterio*, Verily under a mystery;' and either of them useth these terms carnally, corporally, naturally; and that not once or twice, but in sundry places. . . . For answer of same, once again remember, good Christian reader, that notwithstanding M. Harding have found in these two Fathers that Christ's body is corporally and naturally in us, yet hath he not hitherto found that thing which he sought for, neither in these Fathers, nor in any other; that is, that Christ's body is naturally or corporally in the sacrament. .... That we verily and undoubtedly receive Christ's body in the sacrament, it is neither denied, nor in question. St. Augustine saith: *Panis est cordis .... intus esuri, intus siti:* 'it is the bread of the heart; hunger thou within; thirst thou within.' And *the thing that is inwardly received in faith and in spirit, is received verily and indeed.* .... It [the sacrament] is a holy mystery and a heavenly action, forcing our minds up into heaven, and there teaching us to eat the body of Christ, and to drink his blood; not outwardly by the service of our bodies, but inwardly by our faith, and that verily and indeed. The truth hereof standeth not in *any* REAL *or corporal* presence; but, as Hilarius saith, in a mystery, which is, in a sacrament, whereby outwardly and unto our senses we express that thing in our bodies, that must be wrought inwardly in our minds .... [And proceeding to consider more particularly the meaning of the phrases "corporal," &c., after quoting various passages from the Fathers illustrative of their meaning, he says that their sense is,—] Not that Christ's body is corporally or naturally in our body, as is before said, no more than our bodies are corporally or naturally in Christ's body; but that we have life in us, and are become immortal, *because by faith and spirit we are partakers of the natural body of Christ. .... Like as Christ is naturally, corporally, and carnally in us by faith, by regeneration, and by baptism; even so, and none otherwise, he is in us by the sacrament of his body.* In which holy mystery Christ is joined unto us corporally, *as being man*, because we are fed indeed and verily with his flesh; and spiritually is joined to us as God."[1]

[1] JEWEL'S Reply to Harding, Art. V. Works P. S. ed. vol. i. pp. 472—478.

### Theodoret. (fl. a. 423.)

One of the most learned of the Fathers was Theodoret, and with a review of his testimony I shall conclude this Section. Let us first briefly refer to the extracts already given from his writings in the Second Section of this Chapter in favor of the doctrine here maintained, and then consider the passages adduced from him in support of the opposite doctrine.

We have seen, then, that he tells us, that "in the delivery of the mysteries our Lord called *the bread* his body, and *the mixture* [i. e. of wine and water] his blood;" and that, in his time, they were in the habit of "calling *the fruit of the vine* used in the sacrament, after consecration, the blood of the Lord;"[1] and that as our Lord called his natural body, bread, so he called *bread* his body; and as he called himself a vine, so he called *the fruit of the vine*, his blood; "honoring the *visible symbols* with the appellation of his body and blood."[2]

We have seen also, that he calls "the divine mysteries," or, the consecrated things orally received by the communicants, "anti-types of the true body" of Christ, and "symbols" of his body.[3] The symbols are not represented by him as *part* of the consecrated things thus received, but as *the things* received.

We have seen, further, that he maintains that our Lord's risen body, though incorruptible and impassible and immortal and glorified with Divine glory, yet "is a body, having its former circumscription," and that "the Godhead only, as being uncircumscribed, is not local."[4] There is no possibility of reconciling this notion either with the doctrine of the Romanists or with that of the Authors under review.

He expressly states, moreover, in opposition to any such notion as that of Transubstantiation, that the symbols remain unchanged in their nature after consecration, and retain their former substance and figure and form;[5] and, in opposition to any such notion as that of Consubstantiation, that it is "grace" that is "added to nature" through consecration.[6] By Divine grace they are fitted to be effective instruments for bringing about communion with the body and blood of Christ.

[1] See p. 238 above. [2] See p. 248 above. [3] See p. 264 above.
[4] See p. 316 above. [5] See p. 392 above. [6] See pp. 248 and 399 above.

Let us now turn to the passages adduced from Theodoret by Archdeacon Wilberforce and Dr. Pusey in favor of their doctrine.

The following is quoted by Archdeacon Wilberforce, as showing that Theodoret held, that the real body and blood of Christ are present in or under the consecrated bread and wine, and also as proving that *divine worship* was paid to the consecrated things as containing that body and blood. The extract is from Theodoret's Second Dialogue, in which the speakers are a Eutychian and one of orthodox views:—

"*Eutychian.* After the consecration what do you call these things? *Orthodox.* The Body and the Blood of Jesus Christ. *E.* And do you believe that you partake of the Body of Christ, and of his Blood? *O.* Yes, I believe it. *E.* As therefore the Body and Blood of the Lord are one thing before the priestly invocation, but after the priestly invocation they are changed, and become another, so our Lord's Body, since his taking up, has been changed into the Divine essence. *O.* You are taken in your own net. For after the consecration the mystical symbols are not transferred from their own nature. For they remain in their former essence (οὐσίας) and shape and appearance, and are objects of sight and touch, as they were before. But they are understood to be that which they have become, and are believed to be so, and are worshipped, as being those things which they are believed to be."[1]

Before we judge of the meaning of this passage, let us add the context. The words that immediately follow are these:—

"Therefore compare the image with the archetype, and you will see the resemblance. For it is right that the type should be like to the reality. For that body [i. e. our Lord's real Body] has its former form and figure and circumscription, and, to speak compendiously, the substance (οὐσίαν) of a body. But after the resurrection it became immortal, and incorruptible, and was considered worthy of a seat at the right hand of God, and is adored by every creature, as being called by inspired testimony the body of the Lord of nature."

Now in these words we see at once, that that which is upon the table is only considered as the "image" and "type" of the true and real Body of Christ, which is sitting at the right hand

[1] Wilb. Doct. of Euch. pp. 285 and 303; or, 3rd ed., pp. 244, 245, and 261. The passage occurs in Theodoret's Works, ed. cit. tom. iv. p. 126.

of God, and therefore that the preceding words are to be interpreted accordingly. The language used is sacramental language, to be understood according to the *usus loquendi* of the age on such subjects.

Thus, when the orthodox disputant admits, that he partakes of the body and blood of Christ, the language is only similar to that of Facundus Hermianensis, as quoted above,[1] when he says, that as the sacrament of adoption is called adoption, so the sacrament of the Lord's Body and Blood is called his Body and Blood, "not that the bread is properly his body and the cup his blood, but because they contain in themselves the mystery of his Body and Blood," and therefore "the faithful servants of Christ, receiving the sacrament of his body and blood, *are rightly said to receive the Body and Blood of Christ.*"

Against the doctrine of Transubstantiation the language is, of course,—notwithstanding the laborious efforts of Cardinals Bellarmine and Perron and others to explain it away,—clear and express.

Nor is there anything in it favorable to the doctrine of Dr. Pusey and Archdeacon Denison. For it is not said, that the Body and Blood of Christ are joined to the bread and wine, or that the bread and wine after consecration contain the Body and Blood of Christ. But the expression used is, that the bread and wine themselves become the Body and Blood of Christ. Now there are only two ways in which this can be understood. Either they become so substantially, by a change of substance, or they become so symbolically and representatively. They cannot, in the nature of things, become so, by merely having that Body and Blood *joined* to them. Now the former real change Theodoret expressly repudiates; and therefore the latter must be the change intended by him.

And hence, as Theodoret justly says, they are considered and treated as having been made by consecration *symbolically and in effect* the Body and Blood of Christ, and faith looks upon them as such, and treats them with the veneration and reverence due to their sacred character as representatives of our Lord's Body and Blood.

And this veneration is all which the word translated "wor-

[1] See p. 243 above.

shipped"[1] need be understood as meaning; as Cardinal Perron himself, as we have already seen,[2] admits. And Bishop Andrews, a referee to whom the Authors under review cannot object, maintains that the word "is to be taken in that sense, "and cannot here be taken in any other: for, the symbols so "abiding, [i. e. "in their former substance, shape, and kind," "as Theodoret himself contends] it is easily known, no divine "adoration can be used to them, nor any other than hath been "said."[3]

And the word "adore" is used in the Romish Canon Law in the same sense, where it is said that Christians "venerate and *adore* images, but do not honor them with Divine worship, nor any creature;"[4] and in the Gloss on this passage, it is said that in the sense of "dulia" or "veneration," "we may *adore* any sacred thing, *that is, show reverence to it.*"[5]

And that the word is used by Theodoret with reference to the symbol *as distinct from* that which it represents, *and not as containing it*, is clear from Theodoret's own words in another place, where he says, in reply to the Eutychian argument that seemed to depreciate the value of our Lord's Body,—"How can the archetype be of little worth and mean consideration, of which the type [or, symbol] demands reverence [*προσκυνητὸς*, the same word which the Archdeacon translates *worshipped*] and honor?"[6]

Here I suppose the Archdeacon himself would admit, that the word he has translated, in the passage he quotes, as meaning Divine worship, cannot be understood as signifying more than veneration or reverence. And its meaning in one place is the best proof of its meaning in the other, as it is used in both with reference to the same thing. And the use of the word by Theodoret in a higher sense in other passages, is no argument against this conclusion.

[1] The word used is *προσκυνεῖται*. [2] See p. 488 above.

[3] Bp. Andrews, Answer to 18th ch. of Card. Perron's Reply, p. 4. Oper. Post. Lond. 1629. 4to.

[4] Venerantur eas et adorant, sed non serviunt eis cultu divino, nec alicui creaturæ. Corp. Jur. Can. De consecr. dist. 3. c. 28. ed. cit. i. col. 1973.

[5] In dulia vero unum solum, sc. veneratio; et in hoc sensu possumus quamlibet rem sacram adorare, id est, reverentiam exhibere. Ibid. Gloss. in verb. *cultu.*

[6] Οὗ δὲ ὁ τύπος προσκυνητὸς καὶ σεβάσμιος, πῶς αὐτὸ τὸ ἀρχέτυπον εὐκαταφρόνητον καὶ σμικρόν; Theodoret. Dialog. iii. *vocat.* Impatibilis. Op. iv. 190.

The other passage quoted by Archdeacon Wilberforce, is that in which Theodoret says, that "Christ did not give his Body and Blood to his eleven Apostles only, but to him also who had betrayed him."[1]

The passage is similar to one which I have already noticed in the Second Section of this Chapter, in which Theodoret says, that "they dishonor Christ, who receive his most holy Body with unclean hands, and carry it to an impure mouth."[2]

But, as I have there observed, these passages afford not the slightest evidence that Theodoret believed that the real Body and Blood of Christ were so joined to the consecrated elements as to be received by the wicked, inasmuch as Theodoret himself tells us, that the Lord "gave to the symbol the name of the body," and "honored the visible symbols with the appellation of his Body and Blood." In those passages, therefore, he is merely calling the symbols by the name by which, as we have seen, it was usual to call them. And it needs no proof, that any dishonor offered to such representatives of our Lord's Body and Blood, is a dishonor offered to Christ himself.

The passages we have just considered are of course the principal among those quoted by Dr. Pusey;[3] who, however, has added others on which a few remarks must be offered. Among them are, as usual, several which speak of the communicants as receiving the Body and Blood of Christ; as for instance the following:—"For not those who are consecrated priests alone partake of the Lord's Body and Blood, but all who have obtained holy Baptism."[4]

I need hardly stop again to point out the meaning of this phraseology. That the consecrated symbols were called by the Fathers the Body and Blood of Christ, is a fact which no one disputes; and they themselves tell us the reason why they did so. And therefore, in the sacramental sense of the phrase, all the communicants were considered by them as receiving the Body and Blood of Christ. But their maintenance of the doctrine of the Authors under review is a totally different question.

[1] Wilb. Doctr. of Euch. p. 308; or, 3rd ed., p. 265. The passage is from Theodoret's Comment. on 1 Cor. xi. 25. (Op. iii. 238.)

[2] See p. 373 above.

[3] Pusey, Doctrine of Real Presence in Notes, &c., pp. 672—683.

[4] Ibid. p. 677.

Dr. Pusey also quotes the passage in which Theodoret, after speaking of the blood being sprinkled on the lintel and doorposts of the houses of the Hebrews in Egypt, by Divine command, on the night when the firstborn of the Egyptians were smitten, says that this was done, that the Hebrews "might learn the care of God's Providence, and that we, who sacrifice the spotless Lamb, might know that the type had been described beforehand."[1]

But no one can maintain, that we really "sacrifice the spotless Lamb," and actually shed that blood of which the blood sprinkled upon the doorposts was a type. The utmost that even the most strenuous asserter of the real presence of the Body and Blood of Christ ventures to maintain, is, that they are present in an immaterial form. But as, in sacramental language, the consecrated bread and wine are the Body and Blood of Christ, so, sacramentally speaking, by the breaking of that bread and the pouring out of the wine, the sacrifice of Christ is renewed, and the communicants are sacramentally made partakers of the sacrifice. And hence the Fathers frequently speak of the sacrifice in the Eucharist. Thus, Augustine says, that Christ "was sacrificed *once in person*," but "in the sacrament is sacrificed for the people every day."[2] And Chrysostom, with characteristic fervor of language, says that Christ "hath placed himself before us sacrificed;" that Christ "lies before us slain;" is on the table as "a lamb slain and crucified;" and that in the Eucharistic rite we see "the Lord sacrificed and lying," and all the communicants "red with that precious blood."[3] But the very strength of the expressions here used shows that they cannot be understood literally. And Chrysostom himself speaks elsewhere[4] so as clearly to show what his view was on this point, when he says,—"We do not offer an-

[1] Pusey, Notes, &c., p. 676. The passage is from Theodoret. Qu. 24. in Exod. c. xii. Op. tom. i. p. 139.

[2] Nonne semel immolatus est Christus in seipso, et tamen in sacramento non solum per omnes Paschæ solemnitates, sed omni die populis immolatur, nec utique mentitur qui interrogatus eum responderit immolari. August. Epist. ad Bonifac. ep. 98. § 9. Op. ii. 202.

[3] See p. 282 above.

[4] Chrys. Comm. in Heb. hom. xvii. § 3. Op. xii. 168, 169. See it quoted fully in the Appendix.

other sacrifice, as the high priest then did, but always the same; *or rather, we make a remembrance of the sacrifice.*"

And in fact Theodoret himself, in another passage, uses language which similarly shows his real meaning when he speaks of a sacrifice in the Eucharist. In his Comment on the Hebrews he says,—

"It is manifest to those who are instructed in Divine things, that we do not offer any other sacrifice, but perform A MEMORIAL *of that one and saving sacrifice.*"[1]

And hence, in another passage, also quoted by Dr. Pusey,[2] Theodoret speaks of Christ being, in his temple, "sacrificed unsacrificed, and divided undivided, and expended remaining unspent [or, consumed remaining unconsumed]." Sacramentally, virtually, and in effect he is sacrificed, divided, and consumed in the Eucharist; but in reality is not so.

Again, Dr. Pusey quotes the passage in which Theodoret says, in explanation of the words, "They were all baptized unto Moses, . . . . and did all eat the same spiritual meat,"—

"Old things were the type of new, and the law of Moses was the shadow, but grace is the body. . . . . Pharaoh is the type of the devil; the Egyptians of demons; the manna, of the Divine Food; the water from the rock, of the saving Blood. For as they, after crossing the Red Sea, enjoyed the strange food and miraculous water; so we, after the saving Baptism, partake of the Divine mysteries."[3]

But these words do not *identify* "the Divine mysteries" with the real Body and Blood. Nothing more follows from them than that the Divine mysteries are, to the faithful, instruments through a right use of which they become partakers of the Divine Food and the saving Blood; and as to that all are agreed. And the meaning of Theodoret must be judged of by his general doctrine on the subject. And, as we have seen,[4] he himself elsewhere calls "the Divine mysteries" "anti-types of the true body" of Christ, and "symbols" of his body.

[1] THEODORET. Comment. in Hebr. c. viii. vv. 4, 5. Op. iii. 594. See it quoted more fully, and accompanied by the original, in the Appendix below.

[2] p. 678.

[3] PUSEY, Notes, &c., p. 676. The passage is from THEODORET. In Exod. q. 27. Op. tom. i. p. 144.

[4] See p. 264 above.

Another passage quoted by Dr. Pusey is from Theodoret's Comment on Eph. v. 25, which he gives as follows:—

"'Even as Christ the Church.' Nourishing it, and cherishing it, and giving it his own Body and Blood. 'For we are members of his Body, of his Flesh, and of his Bones.' For as Eve was formed from Adam, so we from the Lord Christ; for we are buried with Him in Baptism, and rise again with Him, and eat his Body and drink his Blood." [1]

This passage carries its own interpretation on the face of it. For just as we are "*buried* with Christ in baptism and *rise again* with Him," so do we "eat his Body and drink his Blood."[2] So far as our *bodies* are concerned, the one act, like the other, is done only *symbolically*. So far as our *souls* are concerned, both acts are *real*, but necessarily of a *spiritual* nature.

These are all the passages quoted by Dr. Pusey from Theodoret that seem to me to require any notice.

As to any general statements of the blessed effects of the Eucharist, none will be found stronger than those already quoted [3] from him with reference to the blessings of *Baptism*.

## SECTION V.

GENERAL REMARKS ON THE CHARACTER OF THE ARGUMENT DEDUCED FROM THE FATHERS BY THE AUTHORS UNDER REVIEW IN FAVOR OF THEIR DOCTRINE OF THE REAL PRESENCE.

Having devoted so large a portion of this work to the examination of the testimony of the Fathers on the subject before us, I shall confine myself in this Section to a few general remarks on the way in which the Authors under review have treated this part of the argument.

To examine the sentiments of *all* the Fathers they may have quoted, would be unnecessary and wearisome. The Patristical statements we have just been considering are precisely similar in kind to those of the other Fathers, and therefore the same principles of interpretation apply to both.

Archdeacon Denison has, confessedly, left the task of referring to the Fathers in other hands. He himself professes, that

[1] PUSEY, Notes, &c. p. 681. The passage is from THEODORET. Comm. in Eph. v. 25. Op. iii. 434, 435.

[2] See the remarks of Augustine on this language, in p. 241 above.

[3] See pp. 387, 388 above.

he does "not propose to refer to the testimony of the uninspired Fathers of the Church."[1] And to this he adheres throughout his Sermons, with the single exception of a few references to Augustine, which I have already noticed.[2]

And for this course he gives two reasons. One is, that this testimony "has already been collected by more learned, and abler and better hands;"[3] which is a very prudent reason, and I have nothing to object to it, except that it would have been well for him to have stated what "hands" he refers to. There can be little doubt, however, from his subsequent statements,[4] that the reference is chiefly to the works we have been reviewing of Archdeacon Wilberforce and Dr. Pusey, whom he calls "two great living authorities," and of whose works on this subject he says, "I gladly and thankfully refer to these writings rather than make what would be either a reproduction of their statements, or a greatly inferior statement of my own."[5]

The view taken of Archdeacon Wilberforce's book by Romish writers, as above quoted,[6] and the admission of the Archdeacon into the Church of Rome shortly after its publication, will of course be borne in mind by the reader in the perusal of this statement of Archdeacon Denison.

But the other reason why Archdeacon Denison has omitted to make any particular reference to the writings of the Fathers, is one that deserves remark. He states it thus;—"Because it is confessed, that the stream of authority in support of the doctrine of the Real Presence during the first fifteen centuries is uniform and uninterrupted."[7]

Now, taking the phrase "Real Presence" in this passage (as of course we are bound to do) in the sense which Archdeacon Denison considers to be the only meaning belonging to it,—namely as signifying the actual presence of Christ's real Body and Blood in a spiritual and immaterial form in or under the consecrated elements,—one is almost ready to ask, where Archdeacon Denison has been living, or what books he has read.

The very phrase itself, "Real Presence," is expressly repu-

[1] Denison, Serm. i. p. 12; or, 3rd ed. p. 5.
[2] See pp. 514, 515 above.
[3] Serm. i. p. 12, 3rd ed. p. 5.
[4] Serm. i. pp. 25, 26; 3rd ed. pp. 14, 15.
[5] Ibid.
[6] See p. 28 above.
[7] Serm. i. p. 12; 3rd ed. p. 5.

diated and rejected by Archbishop Cranmer and Bishop Jewel as unknown to Antiquity, and the doctrine which the Archdeacon affixes to the phrase has been over and over again elaborately shown by the most able divines of our Church to be *opposed* to the testimony of the Fathers.

Archbishop Cranmer's work against Bishop Gardiner on this subject is chiefly occupied with proofs from the Fathers against the doctrine of the "Real Presence." And that he was not referring to Transubstantiation in the use of this phrase, we may see by the way in which he has distinguished the two in his Answer to Dr. Smith appended to that work, where he says, accounting for some language used in a Catechism he had published in 1548,—"This I confess of myself, that not long before "I wrote the said Catechism, I was in that error of the *Real Pre-* "*sence*, as I was many years past in divers *other* errors, as of "*Transubstantiation*, of the Sacrifice propitiatory of the priests "in the Mass," &c.[1]

And Bishop Jewel, in his Answer to Harding, devotes one portion (the 5th Article) of the treatise to the disproof of the doctrine of "the Real Presence" *from the Fathers;* and having shown by their testimonies, that we must "seek Christ above in heaven, and imagine not him to be present bodily upon the earth," and "that the body of Christ is to be eaten *by faith only*, and *none otherwise*," and that the bread is a figure whereby the body of Christ "is represented" and "offered unto our faith," he concludes,—"Now consider thou, good Christian reader, with thyself, whether it be better to use this word 'figure,' which word hath been often used of Tertullian, St. Augustine, and of all the rest of the ancient Fathers, without controlment; or else these NEW-FANGLED WORDS, '*really*,' 'corporally,' 'carnally,' &c. *Which words M. Harding is not able to show, that, in this case of being really in the sacrament, any one of all the old Fathers ever used.*"[2]

So that both these leading divines of our Church repudiate the very phrase, "Real Presence," as unknown to Antiquity.

But in consequence of the *ambiguity* of the phrase, it has *not*

[1] CRANMER'S Works, P. S. ed. Pt. 1. p. 374.
[2] JEWEL'S Works, P. S. ed. vol. i. p. 449.

been rejected by *all* our divines, but adopted in the sense of a true presence of Christ's Body to our spirits.

And to this ambiguity Bishop Ridley (whose views on the doctrine advocated by the Authors under review have been already noticed[1]) refers, remarking,—

"Moreover there is ambiguity in this word 'really,' whether it be to be taken as the logicians term it, 'transcendenter;' that is, most generally; and so it may signify any manner of thing which belongeth to the body of Christ by any means: after which sort we also grant Christ's body to be really in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper (as in disputation, if occasion be given, shall be declared[2]) or whether it be taken to signify the very same thing, having body, life, and soul, which was assumed and taken of the Word of God into the unity of Person. In which sense, since the body of Christ is really in heaven, because of the true manner of his body, it may not be said to be here in the earth."[3]

And Dean Aldrich, as we have seen,[4] pointed out the same fact.

But of this fact Archdeacon Denison seems altogether unconscious. With him the phrase "Real Presence" can mean only the doctrine he affixes to it, and apparently all our divines who have used it are set down by him as maintainers of his doctrine. And the sense he affixes to it is precisely that of the Church of Rome.

And this leads me to notice the marvellous ignorance displayed in the context of this passage by Archdeacon Denison as to what is the doctrine of the Church of Rome. "The Church of England," he says, "maintains, as did the Primitive Church, that there is a Real Spiritual Presence,—not the less Real, because Spiritual." He calls it a spiritual Presence, because he holds the real Body to be present in a *spiritual* and *immaterial* form. Then he adds, in order to show the difference between the doctrine of the Church of England, and that of the Church of

[1] See p. 4 above.

[2] He afterwards explains what he means by this, and intimates that it is a presence "by virtue and grace" (p. 197); and says,—"With Bertram I confess that Christ's body is in the sacrament in this respect; namely, as he writeth, because there is in it the Spirit of Christ, that is, the power of the word of God, which not only feedeth the soul, but also cleanseth it." (p. 202.)

[3] Ridley, Disp. at Oxford, Works P. S. ed. p. 196.

[4] See pp. 36—40 above.

Rome,—"The Church of Rome alike maintains the Real Presence, but has substituted for, or at least has added, a MATERIAL to the spiritual character."[1] Now the Church of Rome has done no such thing. She no more holds that our Lord's Body is present in a *material* form, than Archdeacon Denison does.[2]

And this fact may show him, how completely he has been writing in the dark on this subject; and, like many of those who have recently gone over to Rome from among us, writing professedly, and as he supposed, against Romish doctrine, while in fact holding it. I am speaking here, it will be observed, not of the doctrine of Transubstantiation, but of that of the Real Presence.

The Archdeacon talks about "the invention of the 'corporal presence'" as distinguishing the doctrine of Rome from that of England. But he himself holds the "corporal presence" as much as the Church of Rome. A substantial presence of the body itself is a "corporal presence." And that substantial presence the Archdeacon maintains. And no other or different "corporal presence" is maintained by the Church of Rome than by Archdeacon Denison. The only difference between them is, that one holds that Christ's real body is *substituted* for the substance of the bread, and the other that it is *united* with it.

And this want of acquaintance with the facts of the case, has led the Archdeacon to the remarks he has made in the context, about "the uncertainty or indistinctness of theological statement on the part of many of our divines in respect of the doctrine of the Real Presence." He intimates that they appear to him sometimes to affirm it, and sometimes to use language inconsistent with it. But a better acquaintance with their works would show him, that the fault rests with himself, in his want of acquaintance with the sense in which they use the term *Real Presence*. Bishop Jeremy Taylor's treatise "Of the Real Spiritual Presence" will abundantly show him the truth of this remark.

And as the Archdeacon is thus clearly unacquainted with the nature, both of the doctrine of the Church of Rome and of our own great divines, so, though he continually denounces the "Lutheran" doctrine throughout his sermons, he has not a

[1] Serm. i. p. 12; or, 3rd ed. p. 6.

[2] See pp. 135, 138 above.

notion what that doctrine is; for he tells us that the doctrine, "that those who receive unworthily do nevertheless receive the Body and Blood of Christ, and therein and thereby 'eat and drink their own damnation,'" "is not consistent with Zuinglian, *Lutheran*, or Calvinistic doctrine."[1]

Now had he been but slightly acquainted with the Sacramentarian Controversy, he would have known that this very point was one of the most hotly contested points in the controversy between the Lutherans on one side *in favor of it*, and the Zuinglians and Calvinists on the other against it.

And hence he tells us with great simplicity,—"I had hoped "that I had made it so clear that I hold the Real Presence of "the Body and Blood of Christ in the Sacramental Bread and "Wine to be purely and absolutely a Spiritual Presence, as to "have guarded myself definitely and effectually against being "supposed to approach, however remotely, the confines of the "doctrine of Consubstantiation:"[2] — apparently quite unconscious, that they who use the term Consubstantiation no more intend by it a junction of a *material* presence of the body and blood of Christ with the bread and wine than he does.

In the works of Archdeacon Wilberforce and Dr. Pusey, the testimony of the Fathers is largely adduced, and made, in fact, the ground-work upon which their systems are built. And never was the right of private judgment in spiritual matters more largely and freely exercised than has been done by these theoretical opponents of that right; for they put forward, with the utmost confidence, their private interpretation of the Fathers, *opposed as it is to that of our most learned Reformers and divines*, as if it was the authoritative test by which the accordance of any man's doctrine with that of the Fathers is to be summarily judged. It might almost be supposed, that they had never heard of such works as those of Archbishop Cranmer, Bishop Jewel, and others, so completely have they ignored their mode of interpreting the writings of the Fathers. A reader, unversed in such matters, would imagine, that no divine of any note had ever ventured to deny, that the Fathers maintained the doctrine of a Real Presence of Christ's Body and Blood, in a

[1] Adv. to Serm. ii. *note*. [2] Pref. to Serm. i. p. 9; or, 3rd ed. pp. 3, 4.

supernatural way, in or under (or, in their sense of the words, under the forms of) the bread and wine.

Whether the Patristical learning of either one or the other of these writers is such as justly to entitle them to take this ground, I shall leave the reader to judge. He has now before him, in the preceding part of this Chapter, a pretty full exhibition of the testimony of the Fathers on the doctrine under discussion. And I shall here only add a few remarks, pointing out the defective nature of the argument, both of the Archdeacon and Dr. Pusey, in this part of the subject.

On the general character of Dr. Pusey's voluminous extracts from the Fathers in proof of his doctrine of the Real Presence, I have already made some remarks in the preceding Section. Many of them are, as I have shown, entirely *opposed* to his doctrine; many others *irrelevant;* many requiring only a knowledge of the phraseology of the Fathers to show their inapplicability to the point in question. And they are all thrown together in a heap, without order or method or arrangement, or any indication of the way in which they are to be applied. For my answer to his authorities, therefore, I can only refer generally to the preceding Sections of this Chapter.

There is a remark, however, of Dr. Pusey himself, which (however unintentionally on his part) seems to me to give the right clue to the meaning of many of the passages he has quoted. He says,—

"It should be added, that when the Fathers speak of the elements as remaining, they are most often speaking very accurately, in the illustration of the faith against heresy. When they are speaking devotionally of the wonderfulness of God's Gift, it is natural that they should speak only of that gift itself, the Presence of Christ, and the actual imparting of his Body and Blood, not of the outward elements through which that gift is conveyed." [1]

This remark is a just and important one. In controversy the Fathers found it necessary to speak more carefully and accurately, and here therefore they spoke of the bread and wine as remaining bread and wine. But when they were speaking devotionally, they wished to lose sight of everything but the things

[1] Serm. pp. 36, 37.

signified by the outward signs, and therefore spoke only of the Body and Blood, and the blessings that followed from their reception. And this fact alone accounts at once for the phraseology of a large portion of Dr. Pusey's citations.

The treatise of Archdeacon Wilberforce is of a more systematic kind. And it may be worth while briefly to state here the points he has endeavoured to establish, and mention where his arguments on these various points are more particularly met in the preceding pages.

First, then, he claims the testimony of the antient Liturgies as in his favor.[1]

This is fully answered in Sect. 3 of this Chapter.[2]

(2) He asserts that the language of the Fathers and the antient usages both testify that the gift is *in*, that is *inside*, the elements.[3]

The reply is to be found, chiefly and directly, in §§ 2, 3, and 8, 9, 10 of Sect. 2 of this Chapter.[4] And of course, on this and all the following points, the general review of the testimony of the chief Fathers relied upon by the Archdeacon and Dr. Pusey, given in Section 4, must be consulted.

(3) He maintains that all antient writers assert that our Lord's words are to be taken in their natural sense.[5]

This is a large and vague statement, clearly refuted by fact, and which the Archdeacon cannot pretend to have even attempted to prove. And as to what he means by "the natural sense," that his statement is wholly incorrect is apparent from the well-known passages of Tertullian and Augustine, already more than once quoted;[6] to which may be added the passages in § 2 of Sect. 2 above.[7]

(4) He maintains that all the Fathers asserted the Holy Eucharist to be the means by which our Lord's humanity was communicated,[8] and that Christ's Body is the medium through which we are put into relation with him.[9]

Without entering here into the question how far these words are susceptible of an orthodox sense, I observe that the answer

[1] pp. 47—72 and 335—345; 3rd ed. pp. 39—71 and 291—297.
[2] See pp. 439—465 above.
[3] pp. 72—86; 3rd ed. pp. 61—74.
[4] See pp. 237—241 and 250—280 above.
[5] pp. 92, 93; 3rd ed. pp. 78, 79.
[6] See pp. 62 and 70 above.
[7] See pp. 237—240 above.
[8] pp. 102, 103; 3rd ed. pp. 87, 88.
[9] pp. 259—263; 3rd ed. pp. 222—226.

to the doctrine intended to be involved in them by the Archdeacon is to be found more especially in §§ 18—21, 23, 24, 28, of Sect. 2 above,[1] and the review of the testimonies of Chrysostom, Cyril of Alexandria, and Hilary in Sect. 4.

(5) He maintains that they asserted the possible multipresence of our Lord's Body.[2]

The contrary is proved in §§ 14 and 16 of Sect. 2 above.[3]

(6) He maintains that they did not use the terms symbols, figures, antitypes, &c., with reference to the consecrated substances *as a whole*, but only with reference to *one* of the two parts of which he affirms them to be compounded.[4]

The contrary is largely proved in § 10 of Sect. 2 above.[5]

(7) He maintains that they did not speak of the Sacrament of Baptism in terms such as they use respecting the Eucharist; terms implying, as he conceives, their maintenance of a real substantial bodily presence.[6]

The contrary has been shown in §§ 25 and 27 of Sect. 2 above.[7]

(8) He maintains that they distinctly assert the doctrine of the real substantial presence of Christ's natural Body and Blood.[8]

The reply to this is of course to be found more or less throughout the whole of Sects. 2, 3, and 4 above; particularly in the proofs given that they held that Christ is absent from us so far as his human nature is concerned, and that his risen body can only be in one place.[9]

(9) He maintains that they assert worship to be due to the Body of Christ as present within the consecrated elements.[10]

The disproof of this may be found in the review given above in Sect. 4, of the statements of Cyril of Jerusalem, Augustine, Chrysostom, and Theodoret.[11]

(10) He maintains that they assert the reception of the *res sacramenti* by *all*.[12]

[1] See pp. 323—350, 374—381, 417—438 above.
[2] pp. 152—162; 3rd ed. pp. 131—139.
[3] See pp. 293—297 and 309—316 above.
[4] pp. 230—244; 3rd ed. pp. 196—208.
[5] See pp. 260—280 above.
[6] pp. 263—270; 3rd ed. pp. 226—232.
[7] See pp. 381—391 and 395—417 above.
[8] pp. 168—170 and 271—293; 3rd ed. pp. 144—146 and 233—252.
[9] See pp. 297—316 above.
[10] pp. 297—306; 3rd ed. pp. 255—263.
[11] See pp. 487, 488; 507—510; 534, 535; and 583—585 above.
[12] pp. 306—310; 3rd ed. pp. 264—267.

The contrary is proved more especially and directly in § 22 of Sect. 2 above.[1]

These are the leading points he has endeavoured to establish, and as I have already examined the testimonies of the principal Fathers respecting them, I shall not here detain the reader by any further remarks on the evidence he has adduced on the subject.

But I would add a few general observations on the nature of the argument of both these Authors, (common to almost all writers of their school on this subject,) tending to show its invalidity.

And I observe,—

(1) That both these writers keep entirely out of sight (from what cause I will not undertake to say) a fact that largely affects the meaning of seven-tenths of the passages that can be quoted from the Fathers on this subject,—namely, that it was the common practice of the Fathers to call the signs by the names of the things signified.[2]

This omission I have already had occasion more than once to notice, but it is of so much importance that I feel it necessary again to advert to it in this place. It is an illustration (from whatever cause it arises) of their mode of dealing with the subject, which shows how imperfect is their representation of the mind of the Fathers on the question before us.

(2) Almost all their extracts and arguments altogether fail even to reach the point at issue.

The point at issue is, whether the real body and blood of Christ are so in or under the bread and wine as to form one compound whole with them, so as to be received into *the mouths* of the communicants. There is no question as to the effective instrumentality of the consecrated elements in bringing the faithful into communion with, and making them in a spiritual way partakers of, the Body and Blood of Christ. But almost all the Patristical extracts and arguments of the Authors under review prove nothing more than this.

Thus, for instance, Archdeacon Wilberforce, in his argument

[1] See pp. 350–374 above.

[2] For the proof of this fact, see pp. 247—250 above; and see also pp. 241—243.

from the Fathers on the effects of consecration, does not touch the point at issue.

He argues that the passages he quotes from the Fathers show that they considered that the elements "through the consecration" "became the media of a certain mysterious benefit." (p. 77, or, 66.) No doubt they do; but not in the sense in which the Archdeacon would interpret the words.

Again, he urges that the custom of sending the consecrated elements to those not present at the celebration of the Eucharistic rite, and their reservation for use at a subsequent time, show that it was supposed, that they gained "some especial sanctity by consecration," and that "by virtue of their consecration they continued to be the medium of conveying all those benefits which were to be obtained by the devout participant," and gained "a sanctity which made them the means of communicating that gift which was sought for in the Holy Eucharist, and therefore that the blessing was believed to be bound up with the thing itself." (pp. 78; 81; or, 66, 67; 69, 70.)

But these usages afford no proof of the point at issue. All they prove is, that the Fathers supposed, (whether rightly or not, I do not now stop to inquire), that the promised instrumentality of the consecrated elements, in making the faithful partakers of the Body and Blood of Christ, lasted beyond the time of that particular communion in which they were consecrated. The nature of that instrumentality is another question. That the elements gain, by consecration, a peculiar sanctity, is willingly allowed, and that they are instrumentally "the means of communicating that gift which is sought for in the Holy Eucharist." But that "the blessing" is so "bound up with" those elements as to *form one compound whole with them*, so as to be *swallowed by the mouth* of all who swallow the elements, is quite another matter.

"A further proof," says Archdeacon Wilberforce, "is supplied by the manner in which Christ was asserted to communicate himself, as a whole, in every portion of the consecrated elements." (p. 82; or, 70.)

To my mind, this tells in the opposite direction. For, the monstrous absurdity of supposing the immediate multiplication of Christ's body as many times as the priest or the communicant

chose to break the bread into pieces, seems at once to indicate, that this must mean, that the minutest portion of the elements is as much Christ's body and blood—that is, symbolically and as regards the effect produced—as the largest.

So again as to the argument from "the conduct of the recipients." The Archdeacon pleads that they were to receive the Eucharist fasting.[1] True; and Isidore of Sevile, in the very passage in which he mentions this practice, refutes the very doctrine which the Archdeacon raises out of it.[2]

And they were to receive it with the hands crossed, and with great care lest any portion should fall to the ground.[3] But does any man deny, that the consecrated elements, the symbols of Christ's body and blood, are to be treated with all possible respect and reverence? If he who slights the representative of a monarch, is considered, in so doing, as slighting that monarch himself, does not the same rule apply here with even greater force?

Again, the Archdeacon urges, that the Fathers considered that the Eucharist was "the means through which our Lord's humanity was communicated," and that "thus did they understand St. Paul's words, 'we are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones.'"[4]

But that such passages as he here refers to do not prove the point at issue, is clear from the fact, that the Fathers also understand these words of St. Paul as referring to what takes place in *baptism*, as I have already shown.[5] The "communion of the body and blood of Christ" vouchsafed to the believer is not through any *oral swallowing* of the Body and Blood of Christ, but is a communion of a spiritual kind. We have seen abundant evidence that the Fathers attributed our being made concorporal with Christ to spiritual acts. And to deny this because they often described those acts in terms applicable to the acts of the body, is merely to show a want of acquaintance with the nature of the phraseology adopted by them.

It is quite true, that many of them speak of our Lord's Body being communicated to us as a principle of life; our Lord's Body, being possessed of the Divine Spirit, having a vivifying power which is communicated to us through our communion

[1] p. 84; or, 72. [2] See p. 242 above. [3] p. 85; or, 73.
[4] p. 102; or, 87. [5] See pp. 378, &c. above.

with that Body. But these passages must be taken in connexion with those which inform us of the mode in which we are made partakers of our Lord's Body. And they tell us, that it is not by oral manducation, but by faith; not by the mouth of the body, but by the spiritual mouth of the soul. These passages therefore, however much, standing alone, they might lead an unlearned reader to suppose the conclusions which the Archdeacon would draw from them to be well founded, do not really support his argument. They do not show that their Authors imagined the real body and blood of Christ to make up with the bread and wine one "compound whole" in the consecrated elements, or that that body and blood were received by the mouth of the communicant. Notwithstanding these phrases, the Fathers evidently held, that the soul only, and not the body, was the agent in the reception of the body and blood of Christ, the mouth being the recipient only of the symbolical body and blood of Christ.

Of the same kind is his argument that the Fathers spoke of our Lord's Body as "a medium through which we are put into relation with himself;"[1] which he seems to consider conclusive in his favor. And he draws his proof principally from the writings of Cyril of Alexandria. I would refer the reader, therefore, to the remarks made in the last Section on the writings of that Father. And I shall only add here, that the evidence again fails in reaching the point at issue. There may be, and indeed there is, a sense in which the proposition itself of the Archdeacon is perfectly true. But it does not in the least follow from it, that our Lord's real Body is swallowed by our mouths. And I have already had occasion more than once to point out, that, even according to the statements of the Archdeacon himself, the oral reception of that Body, if it *could* take place, would have no effect in bringing us into relation with Christ.

The same is the case with Dr. Pusey. The main point to which his Patristical extracts seem to be directed, is—the great blessings flowing from a reception of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Eucharist. But the question recurs,—*How* do we receive that body? Does it enter our bodily mouths? Or is it so given as to be food for the soul only, and the subject only

[1] p. 259; or, 222.

of spiritual acts? The Fathers themselves tell us, that they speak of the acts of the soul in the same terms in which they describe the acts of the body; following, as they say, the example of Holy Scripture. Is it not clear that they have done so in this matter?

(3) Many of their quotations are made without due regard to the object the writer had in view, and are thus misapplied to a point not referred to in his words.

We have already seen an illustration of this in the testimonies quoted from Cyril of Alexandria, which have been considered in the last Section.

I may mention another in a passage of Leo, quoted by Archdeacon Wilberforce;[1] which at first sight might appear very favorable to his views, but is not so when examined. The passage is this:—

"You ought so to partake of the sacred table as to have no doubt concerning the truth of the body and blood of Christ. For what is taken by the mouth is that which faith believes: and in vain is the answer *Amen* given by those who dispute against that which is received."[2]

Now when we come to consider this passage with its context, and examine its meaning, we shall find that it is speaking of something very different from that to which a cursory reader might apply it. The passage refers to certain heretics, who did not admit the truth of the body and blood of Christ, and against them the Fathers often urged the nature of the Eucharistic elements; as for instance Theodoret, in his second Dialogue. The Fathers pleaded that the bread and wine must be symbols of true and real body and blood, and not of a phantasm or spirit. Leo therefore here exhorts them, when receiving the communion, not to have any doubt as to the reality of Christ's body and blood, and that according to their faith on this point would be that which they received with their mouth. If their faith was right, that which they received would be what it was

[1] pp. 147, 148; 3rd ed. pp. 126, 127.

[2] Sic sacræ mensæ communicare debetis, ut nihil prorsus de veritate corporis Christi et sanguinis ambigatis. Hoc enim ore sumitur quod fide creditur: et frustra ab illis *Amen* respondetur, a quibus contra id quod accipitur disputatur. Leon. Magn. Serm. de jej. sept. mens. 6. serm. 91. c. 3. Op. ed. cit. tom. i. col. 356, 357.

intended to be, an *effectual* symbol of Christ's body and blood, bringing us into communion with them, and the means of bringing to us spiritual blessings; but if they took it denying the reality of that which it was intended to represent, it would be taken in vain.

That the words cannot be taken as maintaining the oral reception of Christ's real body and blood in a spiritual form, is clear from this consideration, that the very object which Leo had in view was, to enforce the doctrine of the *real materiality* of our Lord's body and blood, and therefore his words cannot be applied to a presence of an *immaterial* kind. If Leo's words are to be made use of to prove our oral reception of Christ's real body and blood, an oral reception of that body and blood in their *material form* must be contended for.

(4) Their interpretation of the Fathers is self-contradictory.

They maintain, for instance, that the Fathers held, that the Body and Blood are not present so as to be objects of any of the senses, but only in a spiritual and immaterial form, while nevertheless they interpret all those passages that speak of the Body being broken, and falling to the ground, and the Blood being spilt, as referring to the real natural Body and Blood of Christ. This self-contradiction arises from their refusal to recognize the undeniable fact that the Fathers called the signs by the names of the things signified by them. I have already had occasion to call the attention of the reader to this circumstance, but it is too remarkable a proof of the imperfect and one-sided nature of their mode of arguing on this subject to be passed over here.

Thus, Archdeacon Wilberforce says,—"It is the very principle "of a sacrament, that the inward part cannot in any way be an "object to the senses." And he adds, that the very Fathers to whom he refers for the proof of his doctrine "look upon it as "monstrous to imagine that this hidden gift can in any way "come into contact with our external senses."[1]

But when Chrysostom speaks of "the sacred blood of Christ" being "spilt," and Firmilian of persons "touching the body and blood of the Lord," and Cyril of Alexandria of our Lord "permitting us to touch his sacred flesh,"[2] these passages are inter-

[1] p. 124; 3rd ed. p. 105.

[2] pp. 243 and 307, 308; 3rd ed. pp. 208 and 265.

preted as speaking of the real natural Body and Blood of our Lord.

The objection to this self-contradiction is met by the plea, that as the sacrament consists of two parts, the outward sign and the inward reality, "the one part may borrow the attributes "of the other, as the Fathers speak of touching or breaking the "Body of Christ, though it is the *sacramentum*, or sensible part "only, which can be touched or broken."[1]

It would be a waste of words to dwell upon such an argument, and as I have already noticed it in a previous page,[2] I shall not add any further remarks on it here.

Dr. Pusey takes the same ground, for while he maintains that the presence of Christ's Body and Blood is a presence "not after the order of nature,"[3] and a presence of what he calls a "spiritual invisible substance,"[4] and speaks of it throughout in terms which show that he does not consider the Body and Blood to be so present as to be the objects of any of the senses, yet a large portion of his quotations are similar to those I have just noticed as adduced by Archdeacon Wilberforce, in which the Body and Blood are spoken of as being "touched" and the blood being "spilt," and in which therefore the terms Body and Blood cannot be used of spiritual and immaterial things which can neither be touched nor spilt.

(5) They adapt the statements of the Fathers to their own preconceived doctrine, instead of modelling their doctrine by the statements of the Fathers.

A remarkable instance of this may be seen in the way in which they meet the obvious difficulty that the Fathers call the things received by the communicants to be put into their mouths, *signs, symbols, antitypes, figures*, &c.

That the Fathers give them these names, Archdeacon Wilberforce admits.[5] And his explanation of the difficulty amounts merely to this, that they may be so given, because the consecrated

[1] p. 243; 3rd ed. pp. 207, 208.
[2] See p. 540 above.
[3] Serm. p. 24.
[4] Ibid. p. 39.
[5] *Some* of the cases to which he refers as illustrating this use of the words, I should not quote for that purpose, as they are there clearly used of the elements *before consecration*, and therefore do not prove the point in question; as, for instance, in Basil's Liturgy and the Apostolical Constitutions.

things are *compounded* of two distinct parts, of which *one* is the antitype or sign of *the other*. The judgment as to the reasonableness of this explanation I leave to the reader.

He says,—"Since these two parts, the *sacramentum* and *res* "*sacramenti*, are present together, and since the first is the sign or "token which announces the presence of the other, what can be "more natural, than that it should sometimes be spoken of as "the counterpart of that by which it is accompanied?" [1]

But this is merely to play the juggler with the word *sacramentum*. The word *sacramentum*, when applied to *the things used* in the rite, signifies *that which is put into the mouths of the communicants*, and the Archdeacon maintains that this consists of the sign and the reality joined together. But the Fathers call it a sign. Here therefore there is an obvious discrepancy between the two. And he attempts to remove it merely by shifting and varying the sense of the word *sacramentum* as it may suit his argument. At one time it is to mean, *the sign and the reality joined together;* at another, *the sign only*. When words are so used, all sound argument is at an end. When the Archdeacon uses the word with reference to *that which is given in the rite*, he must at least make up his mind to *which* of these two things he will apply it, and abide by his choice.

He admits,[2] that if the word "figure" or "antitype" was used of the Holy Eucharist [3] "regarded *as a whole*," then it would testify against his doctrine. Now this is just the way in which the passages formerly quoted show that it *was* used. And it is only misleading the reader to represent these passages as merely asserting, that "in this sacrament there is a sign or antitype of Christ's Body and Blood" [4]—a position which everybody maintains.

And he admits, also, that a passage of Magnes shows that there were some who did so apply the terms, though of course he sets them down as *heretics*. "It is not," says Magnes, "a

[1] pp. 232, 233; or 199. [2] Ibid.

[3] There is here the same indefiniteness and ambiguity of expression which is so observable throughout his work. He uses the term Holy Eucharist sometimes for the *rite*, at other times for *the things received by the communicant*. I must consider the term here as used in the latter sense, otherwise its use here would be incorrect and unfair.

[4] p. 243; or, 208.

"type of the Body, or a type of the Blood, as some hardened "persons have fabled, but in truth the Body and Blood of "Christ."[1] It follows, therefore, that where it *is* called a *type*, there it is *not* considered "in truth the body and blood of Christ," but is called so only as being so *sacramentally*. And it is unnecessary to discuss, either with Magnes or the Archdeacon, the question whether those who did so use the term were heretics or not, because, as we have seen,[2] this and similar terms were so used by Catholic Fathers, as is admitted by the Archdeacon himself, though he denies that they used it with that meaning.

And hence, as I have already shown,[3] John Damascen and the Second Council of Nice maintained, that the term *antitypes* could only be applied *before consecration* to the bread and wine. And the Second Council of Nice maintains this, as the Archdeacon himself admits, "*on the ground* that the same thing cannot be both an image and a [the] reality."[4] They had no notion that what was called an *antitype* could be considered to be compounded of an antitype and that of which it was an antitype joined together; and are accordingly *censured by the Archdeacon* for their "forgetfulness that a sacrament by its very nature is twofold."[5]

To support his argument, the Archdeacon further urges, that though the Fathers have used these terms, they have elsewhere expressed themselves so as to show that they believed the reality to be present with the sign in the things put into the mouths of the communicants. Let us examine his proofs. It will be sufficient here to notice the way in which he deals with the testimonies of Tertullian and Facundus on the subject. He says that there are "some expressions in Tertullian's treatise against Marcion, which speak of bread as a figure of our Lord's Body."[6] Now the passage of Tertullian which the Archdeacon is called upon to answer, speaks of *that which is given to the communicants* as a figure of our Lord's Body. So that the Archdeacon commences by an incorrect representation of the words he has to explain. Proceeding to his task, he attempts to

[1] Wilb. On Euch. p. 234 or 200. The passage of Magnes is from Gallandi, Bibl. Patr. vol. iii. p. 541. [2] See pp. 260—280 above.
[3] See pp. 278—280 above. [4] p. 281; 3rd ed. pp. 240, 241. [5] Ibid.
[6] p. 236; or 201, 202.

nullify them by citing passages from Tertullian, which speak of the communicant eating the Body and Blood of Christ, and gives reasons why, in his argument with Marcion, he should "refer to the outward sign" "almost exclusively." But this special pleading is a mere mystification of the reader. Whatever the Archdeacon thinks as to the best mode of conducting the argument with Marcion, the words of Tertullian are clear. They do *not* refer to the outward sign almost exclusively. They distinctly say, that Christ "made the bread that he took and *distributed to his disciples* his own body, by saying, 'This is my body,' *that is, a figure of my body*."[1]

And therefore the fair inference is, that in such passages as those the Archdeacon has quoted, he is speaking, as other Fathers do, in sacramental language, calling the types by the names of those things which they represent, and of which in the case of the faithful they are *effectual* signs.

He next endeavours to explain away the passage already quoted above[2] from Facundus, and his mode of doing so, if admitted, would enable us to make any author say what we wished. Facundus (according to the Archdeacon) says,—

"We call the sacrament of his body and blood, which is in bread and a consecrated cup, his body and blood, not because bread [*or rather*, the bread] is properly his body and a [the] cup his blood, but because they contain within themselves the mystery of his body and blood. Hence also our Lord himself called the bread and cup which he had blessed, and which he gave to the disciples, his body and blood."

Words cannot well be plainer than these; and of course the Archdeacon is obliged to admit that the word *sacrament* here is equivalent to *sign*. But he fixes upon the words "they contain within themselves the mystery of His body and blood" as indicating that Facundus held that the elements "contain within them the hidden reality," "a *res sacramenti* also." And he adds, that "it is obvious from history that such was his belief." And the reason why this is "obvious from history" is no other than this, that "there is no trace that he rejected the general creed of his contemporaries," and the "general creed of his contemporaries"

[1] See p. 62 above. [2] See p. 243 above.

being then proved, as the Archdeacon assumes, by the citation of a few passages from them, the creed of Facundus is thus established!

All this may, no doubt, tend to mystify the general body of readers, but for any other purpose it is worse than useless.

The meaning of the words of Facundus may be seen by the language of the Author of the Commentary on Matthew attributed to Chrysostom, who, speaking of the vessels used for the administration of the Eucharist, says,—"In which there is *not* the true body of Christ, but the mystery of his body is contained."[1] These words at once disprove the meaning which the Archdeacon would attach to the phrase "mystery of his body," and leave the statement of Facundus a clear testimony against the doctrine here opposed.

Dr. Pusey endeavours to get over the difficulty in a similar way, and, as is not uncommon with him, tries to hide it under peculiarly confident phraseology. The difficulty he had to meet was, that the Fathers call the consecrated substances,—the things put into the mouths of the communicants,—symbols, antitypes, &c., and consequently that this language was opposed to the notion that the consecrated substances consisted of *two* things, the outward sign and the thing signified joined together into one compound whole. To meet this difficulty he *assumes* that the consecrated substances *do* consist of these two parts, and then calmly remarks, that "nothing is more natural than that the titles, type, antitype, symbol, figure, image, should be given to the outward part."[2]

And he then proceeds to make the following extraordinary statement:—"The Calvinist party [he means all those who deny the real presence of our Lord's body and blood inside the bread and wine] inferred wrongly, that the Fathers who used these terms, thought, with themselves, that the outward or visible part was an emblem—NOT *of the inward part or thing signified,* but of an absent thing."[3] On the character of this representation I need offer no remark.

He adds, that "the Calvinists assumed" that the outward part "was a type of something absent," which he says is "without

[1] See p. 272 above. [2] Notes on Serm. p. 94. [3] Ibid.

real foundation, and against the natural meaning of the words." So that, according to Dr. Pusey, when the Fathers speak of the things received by the communicants being *symbols*, and *antitypes*, it is against "the natural meaning of the words" to suppose, that the things signified by those symbols and antitypes are not joined with them so as to form with them one compound whole, and thus to be received with them into the mouths of the communicants! I venture to think that the reader will, on the contrary, agree with me, that the *onus* of proof lies on Dr. Pusey, to show, that the things which are called symbols and antitypes are *compounded of* symbols and antitypes and the things signified by them *joined together*.

It is "an unauthorized inference from our Lord's words," he says, "that the words mean only, 'This represents, is a figure of, my absent body.'" "It is true," he adds, "that the outward elements are, as some of the Fathers call them, figures, types, symbols, images of his body. But who authorized men to add, 'of his absent body'?"[1]

This remark is just as if any one should argue,—supposing a person to hold up in his hands a picture of the Duke of Wellington, and to say, "This is the Duke of Wellington,"—that the words must mean, that the Duke of Wellington is really and substantially present in, or under, or under the form of, the picture, for who authorized anybody to change the words into —"This picture is a representation of the absent Duke of Wellington"?

Moreover, there is this insuperable difficulty in the supposition, that the Fathers thought, that the consecrated substances were compounded of the signs or figures and the real body and blood of Christ in a spiritual and immaterial form as the things signified by them,—namely, that this would make a material thing the sign or figure of an immaterial thing. Now this is just what the Fathers, in their controversies with the Marcionites, asserted could not be the case; and they argued that the body of Christ must be a real material body, because bread was made the figure of it. They could not, therefore, have supposed, that the bread and wine were signs or figures of the body and blood of Christ existing in an immaterial form. Their argument

[1] Serm. pp. 25, 26.

against the Marcionites would have been at once overthrown by such a notion.

I notice these points as showing the unsatisfactory nature of *the mode of arguing* adopted by the Authors under review from their citations from the Fathers. They manifest, as it seems to me, the loose, superficial, and prejudiced character of their argumentation. And in dealing with such writings as those of the antient Fathers, peculiar care and accuracy are necessary to enable us to ascertain the precise doctrine they held. A superficial view of their writings would tend to produce, from various causes, a totally erroneous impression as to the real nature of their doctrines. And before I conclude this Chapter it may be worth while to add a few words on this point.

## SECTION VI.

### General Remarks on the Caution necessary in judging of the Doctrine of the Fathers.

To obtain any accurate view of the doctrine of the Fathers, a familiar acquaintance with their *usus loquendi* is essential. Nor can there be a more apt illustration of this than is to be found in our present subject, in the way in which the simple fact, that *the signs are commonly called by the Fathers by the names of the things signified,* influences the meaning of a host of passages which have been adduced by the Authors under review, in apparent forgetfulness of this fact, in support of their doctrine.

Moreover we must view their language *as a whole,* and judge of its meaning by balancing one phrase with another. All parties, I conceive, will admit that their language is often loose and inaccurate. We must observe, therefore, how the meaning of some phrases is to be modified by others, so as to bring the writers into harmony with themselves.

Most important also is it, to consider the object they had in view in the passages we attempt to interpret; against what heresies they were directed, and under what circumstances they were written. A knowledge of the particular doctrine they were attempting to refute may often at once lead us to doubt or reject the applicability of a passage to a subject not in their mind, though it may seem at first sight to indicate their doctrine

respecting it. A remarkable instance of this seems to me to occur in the writings of Cyril of Alexandria against Arius and Nestorius, and other instances may be found in passages of the Fathers directed against the Marcionite and similar errors.

It must be recollected also, that, until a false doctrine has been prominently brought before the Church, less caution is observed in avoiding language that might seem to favor it, than is subsequently found. It is in the nature of things that it should be so, and therefore as an abstract truth it cannot be denied, however much its applicability may be questioned in particular cases. Great advantage arises to divines of Romish and similar views from this circumstance. They avail themselves of such phrases, without regard to the counterbalancing statements which show with what meaning they were used; and accuse those who avoid them, from their liability to be misapprehended, of holding different views from the Fathers. But experience has shown to what they lead; and therefore, after the Reformation, care was taken by the orthodox to use a more correct and guarded phraseology. He therefore who looks at a portion of the phraseology of the Fathers from the point of view from which he would regard similar phraseology from modern divines, would altogether mistake their meaning, and ascribe to them doctrines they never held.

I must add, also, that we find in the Fathers (what is too common in the ministers of all religions) a love for mystifying the doctrines and rites of the Christian faith. With many of them, this was no doubt caused by their original education as Pagans and Philosophers; and when once the example had been set by men of great name and authority, the custom continued and gained force. We see this to have been the case even among the Jews. The doctors of the Law overlaid it with mysteries of their own invention, and threw a veil over its revelations impenetrable to the eye of the great mass of the people. And in addition to this we must observe, that much that has come down to us from the Fathers consists of the pulpit addresses of popular preachers, like Chrysostom, whose chief delight seems to have been in representing things in any but their genuine and natural forms and proportions. And consequently the simple truths of Christianity present themselves, in

such writings, under a very different form from what they bear in the Scriptures of the New Testament.

All these circumstances, and many similar that might be added, must be borne in mind by any one who would ascertain the real doctrine of the Fathers on the truths of Christianity.

Much indeed might be said on this point; and with no little reason, when there are so many among us who seem to think that nothing is easier than to form a system of doctrine out of the Fathers, and impose it upon the world under the name of *the voice of the Church, the testimony of Catholic consent,* and other similar appellations. But I have trespassed too long upon the patience of the reader in this Chapter to do more than thus slightly notice it, leaving it to his own judgment and common sense to estimate the degree of importance due to the caution suggested in the above brief remarks.

PRESENTED
BY THE
Church of England
Book Society,
11, ADAM STREET, LONDON.
FOUNDED 1880.

Treasurer.
FRANK A. BEVAN, ESQ.
Secretary.
JOHN SHRIMPTON, ESQ.